A STUDY OF ASSIMILATION AMONG THE ROUMANIANS IN THE UNITED STATES

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
MAR 24 1930

BY L. C.
CHRISTINE AVGHI GALITZI, M. A.
Research Fellow of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and of the Rockefeller Foundation

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE
FACULTY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK
1929

3781
C72G
UNCLASSED
Dissertation
STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
WITHDRAWN

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/studyofassimilat0000unse_j2u2

A STUDY OF ASSIMILATION AMONG THE ROUMANIANS IN THE UNITED STATES

BY

CHRISTINE AVGHI GALITZI, M. A.

Research Fellow of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and of the Rockefeller Foundation

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE FACULTY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK

1929

COPYRIGHT, 1929

BY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Dedicated to

WILLIAM NELSON CROMWELL, LL.D.

Grand Cross of the Order of the Star of Roumania
President of the Society of the Friends of Roumania, Inc.

IN GRATEFUL RECOGNITION OF HIS ENCOURAGEMENT
AND THAT OF THE SOCIETY IN THE
PREPARATION OF THIS BOOK

PREFACE

LITTLE is known about the Roumanians in the United States. This study is intended as a small contribution to an understanding of the adjustment of immigrants to the American environment and to the processes of assimilation.

This undertaking was facilitated by the fact that the writer, born in Roumania, was not only familiar with the different backgrounds from which these immigrants came, but could also use their language and get their reactions to new environment, unhampered by dependence upon the English language, which these immigrants do not know well, and by any fear on their part that any information given to the investigator might be used against them. No claim is made of having covered all the phases of Roumanian immigration, or of having solved the many-sided problems concerning adaptation to the new environment. Conscious of the vast amount of unexplored material, the writer can only plead that she endeavored throughout her study to give an unbiased presentation of such facts as she was able to secure through personal investigation and observation.

I should like to acknowledge my great indebtedness to Professor Samuel McCune Lindsay, Professor of Social Legislation at Columbia University, for the unfailing aid and counsel he gave me in the preparation of this study, and to thank Professors R. E. Chaddock, A. A. Tenney, R. M. MacIver and F. H. Giddings for their suggestions and critical comments. I am also indebted to many American and Roumanian authorities in the United States and to vari-

ous leaders of social and religious institutions who volunteered the information needed; to friends whose encouragement and sympathetic understanding of the difficulties encountered was a great help; and to Miss K. H. Claghorn, Professor H. P. Fairchild, Mr. J. Karpf, Mr. Bruno Lasker, and Mr. and Mrs. Savel Zimand for criticism and suggestions. Finally, my deep gratitude is due to the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and to the Rockefeller Foundation, whose generosity, through the form of a two-year research fellowship, has allowed me to carry out this study.

CHRISTINE GALITZI

NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 1, 1929.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE 7

CHAPTER I

Introduction, scope, purpose and methods of the study 11

CHAPTER II

Roumanian immigrants, their number and character 17

CHAPTER III

The home background of the Roumanian immigrants 43
The Roumanians, Transylvanians and Roumanian Macedonians.

CHAPTER IV

The distribution of Roumanian immigrants in the United States. Urban, rural, regional, occupational 62

CHAPTER V

Living conditions and standards in the new country 77

CHAPTER VI

The persistence of earlier ethnic contacts in the new life 87
The beneficial and cultural societies. The Church; Greek Orthodox, Greek Catholic, Roumanian Baptist. The parochial school. The socialistic clubs. The press 87

CHAPTER VII

The development of new community contacts. 118
The school, trade-union affiliations, political clubs.

CHAPTER VIII

The old culture and the new environment 134
Survival and break-up of customs.
Adjustment and maladjustment.

PAGE

CHAPTER IX

The principle of assimilation. The process of assimilation; economic, cultural, ethnic 156

CHAPTER X

The first and second generation. Elasticity of the process of assimilation. Economic and cultural assimilation of Roumanian immigrants of first and second generation. Presentation of cases. The case of the non-assimilable. Age, illiteracy, absence of children or of family life a hindrance to assimilation. The question of intermarriage 170

CHAPTER XI

Conclusions 216

CHAPTER XII

Appendix: I. A study of one hundred Roumanian families in Chicago 221

II. The names and addresses of the existing Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies af America . . . 253

Bibliography 256

Index 273

Vita 283

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The voluminous literature devoted in recent years to the problems arising from immigration seldom takes notice of the Roumanians, and such mention as is made of them is generally restricted to statistical reference. The student who is especially interested in the migratory movements of peoples may not be aware of a Roumanian immigration to the United States.

This book endeavors to present the chief facts about the recent establishment of the Roumanians in the United States, and while pointing out the traits peculiar to them, aims particularly to show the processes of assimilation at work among these immigrants under the pressure of the American environment. No attempt is made to prove the desirability or undesirability of these immigrants, or to meet the argument of the restrictionists, the biologists, and the nationalists as to the impairment of American ideals. Our approach does not seem to differ greatly from that of others who are working in the same field of investigation with other ethnic groups. For migratory movements of all peoples involve a similarity of processes with regard to their dislocation from the original background, their transplantation into the new environment and their adjustment, resulting in their resistance to the new *milieu social* or their more or less complete adaptation to it. The Roumanians present a characteristic common to some other immigrant groups, in that they are drawn from different geographical environments: the Old Kingdom of Roumania; the Transcarpathian provinces of Banat, Transylvania, and Bukovina, formerly under the Austro-

Hungarian rule; and the provinces of Epirus, Thessaly, and Pindus, formerly under the Turkish and Greek flags and now incorporated in Greece, Albania, Turkey, and Jugo-Slavia. In order to preserve these geographical distinctions, Roumanians are referred to as Roumanians, Transylvanians, and Roumanian Macedonians, or Koutso-Valachs.[1] In view of this diversity in the home background because of the geographical barriers which isolated them for many centuries from each other, the problems related to the assimilation of these Roumanians become of special interest.

[1] It is beyond the scope of this study to give ample consideration to the antecedents of the Roumanians and their distribution in the Balkans. For the benefit of the reader it will suffice to give a short historical sketch concerning the origin of the Roumanian people. Two alternative theories are held by Roumanian historians. Hasdeu, Xenopol and Onciul consider the Roumanians as the descendants of the autochthonous Dacians, who lived in the Carpatho-Danubian region, or Dacia, long before it was conquered by the Romans in A. D. 101. The Germans, Mommsen and Kiepert, share this opinion. They further maintain that at the time of the retreat of the Roman legions from Dacia by order of Emperor Aurelian about A. D. 270 or 275, the majority of the population from Dacia Felix accompanied them in order to escape from the invasion of the Goths. They first settled in the country on the East bank of the Danube called New Dacia or Maesia (the present Bulgaria). Then, under the continuous pressure of the barbarian invasion, the Romanized Dacians pushed as far as the Pindus, Thessaly and Epirus. After the invasion of the Huns and their devastation of Western Europe, the Dacians of Maesia returned to their former territory, Dacia, on the left bank of the Danube river and through intermarriage with other neighboring tribes became the present-day Roumanians. According to Professor N. Iorga of Bucarest, the ancestors of the Roumanians are the Thracians, the Scythians and the Dacians or Getae (see Iorga, N., *A History of Roumania*, London, 1925, pp. 13, 15) whom the Romans called *Davi* or *Daii* and who were conquered by Emperor Trajan, in A. D. 101, when he defeated the Dacian King Decebalus. Trajan occupied the whole Danubo-Carpathian region, and Romanized the Dacians, by making them adopt instead of their own language the vulgar Latin spoken by the Roman legions, which in the course of years has become the present-day Roumanian. Professor Iorga favors the idea of the continuity of the Daco-Roman population in the Carpatho-Danubian region.. He attri-

Their economic adaptation to the American environment is of just as great interest as their social assimilation, because 89.0% of the Roumanian immigrants belong to the class of farm laborers and only 0.4% to the professional class. Would the peasant majority of this group head for great open areas and continue the occupations they had in their home villages, such as farming and cattle-breeding, or would they yield to the call of American industry and crowd together in the already congested cities of America? Have these Roumanians, Transylvanians, and Roumanian-Macedonians been scattered in America among immigrants with whom they were formerly neighbors in their country of origin? Have they lost, in this process of dissemination, their group or village allegiance or their racial affinities? Are they being absorbed too rapidly, forced into standardized molds of American life before they have thoroughly grasped the meaning of American institutions? Or have they gradually regrouped themselves along lines of former neighborliness or district or province allegiance in order either to resist absorption or gradually to modify their modes of thought and action, thus complying with the standards and the ideals of America? Has their racial cohesion been so dominantly strong as to maintain their ethnic integrity in the new environment and to oppose resistance to the slow and more or less latent process of Americanization? Or has their social organization along the lines of their national cultural heritage been but a school for the better understanding of America and the better solving of the immigrant's problem

butes the presence of the Daco-Romans (who are considered the ancestors of the Aromans, also called Arumanians, Tsintsars, Koutso-Valachs or Roumanian Macedonians) in Pindus, Thessaly and Epirus to a later forced colonization or emigration, occurring during the Slavic invasion into the Danubian and Carpathian provinces, in the sixth and seventh centuries A. D (see Iorga, N., *Histoire des Roumains de la Peninsule des Balkans*, Bucarest, 1919).

of double allegiance to his country of origin and to that of his adoption? These are the questions kept in mind in presenting the material. Needless to say, the temptation to include in the study the 50,000 Roumanian Jews, who have migrated from the Old Kingdom of Roumania, has repeatedly presented itself; but despite the light that such a study would have thrown upon the differences in the degree of assimilation presented by the two ethnic groups, Jews and Roumanians, such an undertaking was deemed impossible. There is no feeling of prejudice in thus discriminating, but simply the writer's unfamiliarity with the Jewish traditions and the necessity of confining the study to a field sufficiently narrow to be investigated thoroughly. Therefore the study is confined to the Roumanian Gentiles, that is, the Roumanians from the Old Kingdom, the Transylvanians, and the Roumanian Macedonians.[1] The observations presented in this study emphasize the problem of the assimilation of these Roumanian immigrants, and are based on information gathered from diverse sources. First is the survey of 150 Roumanian families, 100 of whom were taken from the Roumanian colony in Chicago,[2] and the remainder from

[1] A distinction is made between Roumanian immigration or Roumanian immigrants and immigration from Roumania or immigrants from Roumania. Roumanian immigration refers to the migration of Roumanians from any country of Europe, e. g. Austria-Hungary, Russia, Greece, Turkey, irrespective of their citizenship. Immigration from Roumania refers to the migration of those of different nationalities from Roumania, e. g. Germans, Greeks, Hungarians, Russians, etc.

[2] The study of the Roumanians in Chicago was carried out during the summer session of the University of Chicago, where the writer was in residence for a period of almost three months, June 19 to September 2, 1927. The schedules used in connection with this investigation were checked by Doctor Edith Abbott, Dean of the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago, to whom special thanks are due for valuable suggestions in connection with the investigation. The results of the study of the Roumanians in Chicago were presented in a term paper to Professor J. Steiner. They have been recast and revised and are incorporated in this study as a special chapter in the Appendix.

the 17 different Roumanian colonies in the following localities visited: Akron (Ohio), Alliance (Ohio), Chicago (Illinois), Cleveland (Ohio), Columbus (New Jersey), Detroit (Michigan), Florence (New Jersey), Gary (Indiana), Homestead (Pennsylvania), Indiana Harbor (Indiana), McKeesport (Pennsylvania), New York City, Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania), Philadelphia (Pennsylvania), Trenton (New Jersey), Worcester (Massachusetts), and Youngstown (Ohio). A second source consists of interviews with leaders not only of the Gentile colonies, which form the subject matter of this study, but also with those of the Roumanian Jews, in order to trace the relationship in the new environment between the Roumanian Jews and the Roumanians, who prior to their arrival in the States were citizens of the same country.[1] Third, interviews with heads of American industries and social agencies, in more or less direct contact with the immigrants, such as the school authorities, the heads of police courts and juvenile courts, workers in the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A., directors of community centers, playgrounds, and settlements. Fourth, a careful study of the Roumanian press in the United States for a period of two years (from January 1, 1927 to December 31, 1928), including *America,* the only daily Roumanian newspaper; *The Awakening,* the organ of the Roumanian socialist workers; the *Romanul,* the weekly paper which seems to be in opposition to the daily paper; the *Curierul Roman,* the special paper of the Macedonians; the *Luminatorul,* the weekly of the Roumanian Baptists and the *Buletinul Oficial,* the official bulletin of the Union of the Roumanian Greek

[1] It was found in almost all the localities visited where Roumanian Jews and Roumanian Gentiles had settled, that there was no intergroup activities between them and that except for the impartiality of the Roumanian press, especially *America,* which offers its news columns and advertisements to both the Roumanian Jews and Gentiles, only on rare occasions did the intellectuals of the two groups come together.

Catholic societies of America. Fifth, the book by Mr. S. Drutzu, in collaboration with Mr. A. Popovici,[1] *Romanii in America,* the only book in Roumanian dealing with the Roumanians in both Canada and the United States. This volume was a valuable guide in checking the first-hand information obtained by personal contact with the Roumanian communities, and gave also some additional information. Sixth, the annual reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration and the United States Census. The investigation continued through four months, from May 22 to September 30, 1927. Six weeks were spent in visiting the different colonies, and ten in studying the Roumanians in Chicago.

Prior to the investigation, however, an effort was made to become familiar with the general problem of immigration and to establish, throughout the winter of 1927 and 1928, a direct contact with the Roumanians in New York by participating in their social activities whenever opportunity made it possible. It is necessary to add here that whereas the statistical information regarding the Roumanians ends with June 30, 1928, the contact with the Roumanian colonies, either indirectly through their press or directly through personal participation in social activities, was carried on until December 31, 1928.

[1] Mr. Drutzu and Mr. A. Popovici have made a valuable contribution in their book, *Romanii in America* (Bucarest, Cartea Romaneasca, 1926), by interpreting the American environment to the would-be immigrant. They have fully covered the industrial, economic and social life of the Roumanians, both in Canada and the United States, and have included a chapter devoted to the Roumanian Jews. The purpose of the present study is to follow the Roumanian immigrant in the process of his assimilation under the pressure of the new environment.

CHAPTER II

The Roumanian Immigrants

THEIR NUMBER AND CHARACTER

The immigrants from Roumania to the United States of America belong to the so-called "new immigration"[1] which has in recent years contributed to the social structure of American life a variety of ethnic elements from Southeastern Europe. Springing from a country itself streaked with a variegated population, the stream of immigration from Roumania has carried out of the cradle of the country not only people from its ethnic stock, but also the Roumanian Jews, Turks, Germans, Bulgarians, etc. who formed one-eighth of the total population of the Old Kingdom[2] of Roumania. The United States has received also the contri-

[1] From 1882 the immigration to the United States has been classified into "old immigration" and "new immigration", this distinction being officially sanctioned by the Immigration Commission of 1907-1911. "The old immigration" includes those from England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland; the "new immigration", those from Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, Servia, Spain, Syria and Turkey. (See Fairchild, H. P., *Immigration*, New York, 1923.)

[2] See Rommenhoeller, C. G., *La Grande Roumanie*, La Haye, 1926, p. 70. According to him the total population of the Old Kingdom of Roumania compiled from official data is 7,800,000 inhabitants of whom 6,800,000 are Roumanians, i. e. seven-eighths of the total population. Of the remainder 1,000,000 or one-eighth, the Roumanian Jews number 300,000, the Bohemians 225,000, the Turks 170,000, the Bulgarians 150,000, the Magyars 50,000, the Lipovanians (Russians) 40,000, the Germans 35,000 and other nationalities 30,000. (See also: Deutsche Tagesport, nos. 99 and 100, 1920.)

bution of other streams of Roumanian immigrants, coming from countries such as Austria-Hungary, Russia, Turkey and Greece, where the Roumanians were settled long ago, and where they have maintained their racial characteristics despite the differences in citizenship and the surrounding other nationalities of antagonistic interests. In this study the tributary streams of Roumanian Jews, Germans, Greeks and other emigrants from Roumania (considered both in its pre-war and post-war boundaries) have received no consideration, for the main interest centers around the Roumanians as an ethnic group. It was deemed advisable, in view of the purpose of the study, to bring together the different streams of Roumanian immigration [1] by eliminating the geographical and political barriers which separated the different groups of Roumanians in Europe, by differentiating between citizenship and ethnos and by isolating the whole stream of Roumanian immigration from the varied ethnic groups which have migrated from Roumania. In order, however, to preserve the local characteristics of the different Roumanian groups and also to avoid any confusion in the reader's mind as to the difference between citizenship and ethnos, their provincial names have been retained. Three of these are of special importance because in the complex process of their dislocation, transplantation and adaptation necessitated by their migration, they succeeded in the new environment in restoring their group life along lines of allegiance to the specific culture of the province of origin. These groups are: (1) the Roumanians from the Old Kingdom, (2) the Transylvanians—including in this general term also

[1] Throughout the study the term "Roumanian Immigration" refers to that group composed of all the Roumanians considered as an ethnic group irrespective of their country of origin; to "Immigration from Roumania" to the group emigrating from Roumania and including all Roumanian citizens of various ethnic stock, e. g. Roumanian Jews, Germans, Greeks, etc.

the inhabitants of the provinces of Banat and Bukovina—from Austria-Hungary, and (3) the Roumanian Macedonians, or Kutzo-Vlachs from Greece and Turkey belonging to the Roumanian stock. The date of their arrival in the United States is a matter of controversy among the representatives of these groups. According to their leaders the Roumanians began to come in very small numbers about 1890; the Transylvanians about 1896; and the Roumanian-Macedonians in 1903. However, both from hearsay and from authenticated sources, we know of sporadic cases of Roumanian immigrants landing in America prior to 1890. It is said that a group of people living at present in Enseñado (Mexico) [1] are descendants of the pioneer Roumanian immigrants who, attracted by the California gold rush, left their country about 1849. After sailing many days on the rough seas and often threatened with shipwreck, they reached the coast of Mexico. Despite the difficulties already encountered, they bravely began to cover on foot the remaining distance to California. However, they renounced at last the alluring vision of reaching the gold region. At the end of their physical resistance and morally exhausted by the numerous hardships of their march, they settled in Enseñado. Instead of gold digging they took up the occupation which was theirs in the old country — farming. Up to the present day this small community in Enseñado retains in its Greek Orthodox religion most of the Roumanian customs and traditions and also the Roumanian language mixed with some Spanish words.

In addition to this group which never reached the United States, there are isolated cases of individual immigration, such as those of G. Pomutz and Nicolae Dunca,[2] both of

[1] Drutzu, S., *Romanii in America,* Bucuresti, 1926, p. 110.

[2] G. Pomutz had a most brilliant career when serving in the 15th Volunteer Regiment of Iowa, throughout the Civil War. Among the first volunteers,

whom attained prominence through valuable service rendered to the United States in the War of Rebellion. It is no wonder that the Roumanian settlers in the United States take a great deal of pride in these two pioneers. But these isolated instances cannot be said to form an immigration movement.

We shall have to wait for a considerable number of years before the influx of Roumanians assumes the numerical importance and the continuity which lend to it the character of a group migration. The statements of the Roumanian leaders as to the dates of the first arrival of the Roumanians, Transylvanians and Roumanian-Macedonians in the United States need the support of some authoritative corroboration. Our best sources of official data [1] relative to the Roumanian immigration are the annual reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration and the United States Census. The former help us to follow the immigration movement; the latter gives us the Roumanian population in the United States at a given time. The annual reports give 1881 as the starting year of the "Immigration from Roumania" with 11

he was received with the rank of captain, but due to his acts of bravery in the battles of Shiloh, Corinth, Vicksburg, Atlanta and Savannah, he was promoted by General Belknap to the grade of Major, then to that of Colonel, and finally to that of Brigadier-General. Later President Andrew Jackson appointed him Consul General of the United States to Petrograd, where he held this office for 12 years, and where he died October 12, 1882. (See Drutzu, S., *op. cit.*, pp. 98-109 also Belknap, General W. W., *History of the Fifteenth Regiment, Iowa, Veteran Volunteer Infantry*, Keskuk, Iowa, 1887, pp. 12, 38, 39, 175, 186-189, 209-214, 383, 507-509.)

During the Civil War Nicolae Dunca from Iassy, enlisted in the Regiment of 9th Volunteers of New York and his services were appreciated even before the regiment took part in the battles of Centerville and Bull Run. He distinguished himself at the battle of Cross-Keys (Va.) in 1862, where he met his death in executing the orders of his general, John C. Fremont. His tomb is still to be seen in the churchyard of the Union Church at Cross-Keys. (See Drutzu, S., *op. cit.*, p. 97.)

[1] The Roumanian Government records statistical data on Immigration and Emigration since 1920 only; they appear in the *Buletinul Muncei.*

immigrants. In the ensuing years the volume of immigration grew rapidly, attaining a total number of 6359 by 1890 and 19,109 by 1900. This immigration from Roumania

TABLE I

IMMIGRANT ALIENS ADMITTED BY COUNTRY OF LAST RESIDENCE, ROUMANIA, AND BY RACES [1], 1881-1928

Years	Roumania, country of last residence and number of immigrants	Distribution of Immigrants by Races			Per cent Distribution			
		Roumanians	Hebrews	Other Nationalities	Total	Roumanians	Hebrews	Others
1881–1890...	6,359							
1891–1898 [2]..	4,685							
1899–1900...	8,065	274	7,526	265	100.0	3.4	93.3	3.3
1901–1910...	53,008	2,916	67,301	2,791	100.0	5.5	89.2	5.3
1911–1920...	13,311	2,737	9,691	883	100.0	20.5	72.8	6.7
1921–1924 [3]..	59,193 [4]	8,412	38,030	12,751	100.0	14.2	64.2	21.6
1925–1928...	5,020	965	2,666	1,389	100.0	21.0	53.1	25.9
Grand Total 1881–1928.	149,641							
Total 1899–1928.	138,597	15,304	125,214	18,079	100	11	76	13

[1] Computed from *Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration.*

[2] Prior to 1898, there was no classification according to Races.

[3] The lack of uniformity in the class intervals of this table was imposed by the necessity of warning the reader against undiscerning interpretation of or comparison with these figures, if presented in decades. On account of the progressive method of the Bureau of Immigration in gathering statistical data and also of the immigration laws of 1921 and 1924, which directly affected the influx of immigrants to the United States, this unequal division was deemed necessary, in order to avoid misleading conclusions. Thus the annual amount of increase in the decade 1901-1910 is 5,300; in and for 1910-1920 it is 1,331; in and for 1921-1924 it is 14,798; and in and for 1925-1928 it is 1,255. It is worth noticing that the last two annual amounts of increase are far above the quotas of 7,419 and 603 alloted to Roumania by the respective Immi-

when judged by the classification of the immigrants according to races [1] is far from presenting an ethnic homogeneity.

The figures from the Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration for the fiscal years 1899 and 1900 show that 93.3% of the 8065 admitted aliens, whose country of last residence was Roumania, were Roumanian Jews,[2] 3.3% Germans, Greeks, Bulgarians, etc., and only 3.4% of pure Roumanian stock. It is regrettable that anal-

gration Laws of 1921 and 1924. We should bear in mind, however, that together with the regular immigrants included in the quota, there are those of the "preferred class": (a) the alien parents, wives and minor children of American citizens; (b) the ex-resident immigrants, who are not fully naturalized and are re-entering the United States outside the quota; (c) and the foreign students. This explains the great difference between the Roumanian quotas for 1921-1924 and for after July first 1924 and the annual amounts of increase of the Roumanian immigration for the same periods.

[4] This figure was considerably enlarged by the conditions determining the post-war influx to the United States.

[1] Introduced for the first time in 1898.

[2] The Roumanian Jews do not belong to the Roumanian ethnic stock. They have migrated to Roumania in the course of the centuries, when persecution has driven them away from the land where they were formerly established. Some claim that the Jews were first received in Dacia (formerly Roumania) by Decebalus, the Dacian King at the time when Titus destroyed Jerusalem, in 70 A. D. Later driven from Hungary, the Jews came into Wallachia during the reign of Vladislav Basarab, between 1365-1367. Jews of Spanish descent came to Roumania from Turkey during the 16th century, and in the following centuries a gradual infiltration of Galician and Polish Jews took place as a result of the pogroms in Russia. (See Dr. E. Schwarzfeld, "The Jews of Roumania from the Earliest Times to the Present Day," in the *American Jewish Year Book*, New York, 1901-1902, Sept. 14-Oct. 1, pp. 25-29.)

In more recent years, following the Russian Revolution of 1917, a great number of Russian Jews found refuge in Roumania, especially in Bessarabia, and a considerable number of Galician Jews have become Roumanian citizens since the annexation of Bukovina to Roumania. But whether natives of Roumania or citizens by naturalization, the Jews in Roumania do not belong to the ethnic stock of Roumania. Differences in ethnos as well as in religion distinguish the two groups.

ogous data for the years 1881-1898 were never compiled. But perhaps it may be assumed that the figures for 1899-1900 are fairly representative samples for the whole period 1881-1900 and that this immigration from Roumania is primarily Jewish and only to a slight degree Roumanian.[1]

This assertion is justified by the fact that throughout this period only Roumanian Jewish organizations were developed in the United States, such as:

(1) The Roumanisch-Amerikanischer Brüderbund, in 1884.
(2) The American Star, in 1885.
(3) The first Roumanian American Congregation, in 1885.
(4) The Roumanian American Republican Club, in 1887.[2]

But the total absence of any Roumanian social organization does not necessarily prove that there were no Roumanian immigrants in the United States. They might have been in such small numbers and scattered in such a way as to make impossible any social organization. The Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration for the years 1899 and 1900 classifying the Roumanian immigrants by race,

[1] Our assumption is corroborated by Mr. S. Joseph's study of "Jewish Immigration to the United States" covering a period of 30 years, 1881-1910. His data are based on the *Annual Reports* of the Commissioner General of Immigration supplemented by the annual reports of the United Hebrew Charities of New York, the Association for the Protection of the Jewish Immigrants of Philadelphia, and the Hebrew Immigrant Society of Baltimore. Summing up the number of Roumanian Jews recorded by these societies, Mr. Joseph finds a total of 19,756 Jewish immigrants arriving from Roumania during 1881-1900 as against 19,109 given by the official records of the Bureau of Immigration for the whole Immigration from Roumania up to 1900. (See Joseph, S., *Jewish Immigration to the United States*, New York, 1914, pp. 89, 166.)

[2] Hermalin, D. M., "The Roumanian Jews in America," in *The American Jewish Year Book*, New York, 1902, pp. 88-103.

disclose a total of 494 Roumanians, of whom 274 came from Roumania, 204 from Austria-Hungary and 16 from other countries (see Table II).

TABLE II

ROUMANIAN IMMIGRANTS ADMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES, BY COUNTRY OF LAST RESIDENCE, 1899-1928

Years	Race	Country of last residence			Per cent Distribution			
	Roumanians	Roumania	Austria-Hungary	Other Countries [1]	Total	Roumania	Austro-Hungary	Other countries
1899–1900[2] ..	494	274	204	16				
1901–1910 ...	82,210	2,916	76,551	2,743	100.0	3.5	93.1	3.4
1911–1920 ...	54,978	2,737	47,812	4,429	100.0	4.9	86.9	8.2
1921–1924 ...	10,569	8,412	66	2,091	100.0	79.6	.6	19.8
1925–1928 ...	1,575	965	4	606	100.0	61.3	.2	38.5
Total 1859–1928 .	149,826	15,304	124,637	9,885	100	10	83.4	6.6

No exact dates can be given for the Roumanian immigration to the States. The decade 1890-1900 may be considered as the one during which the Roumanians and the Transylvanians first entered the portals of America.[3]

[1] The other countries from which Roumanians migrated are: Russia, Czecho-Slovakia, Bulgaria, Turkey, Greece. Of these Roumanians, the Macedonians are the only ones who have succeeded in organizing themselves in the United States. As they came from Greece, Turkey and Albania, which prior to the war had different geographic boundaries, it has been impossible to enumerate them separately. Their approximate number is 1500, according to the statement of their leaders.

[2] For the inequality of class intervals consult footnote 3 of Table I.

[3] This assumption is made by the Immigration Commission. In its report, classifying foreign-born employees in the manufacturing and mining industries, as to sex, race and number of years in the United States, it shows that of 1895 Roumanian men, reporting complete data in 1907, 1867 had arrived within ten years just preceding the investigation, while of the 145 women reporting, 141 came between 1898-1907. (See *Abstracts of Reports of Immigration Commission*, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1911, vol. i, pp. 349-350).

From 1901 on, the "Roumanian immigration"[1] to the United States increased constantly, except for war periods up to 1924, totaling by June 30th, 1928, 149,826 Roumanians for the period 1899-1928, of whom 10.0% came from the Old Kingdom of Roumania, 83.4% from Austria-Hungary and 6.6% from other countries, Turkey, Greece, Russia, etc. (See Table II.) This numerical superiority of the Transylvanians must be borne in mind when seeking an explanation of their decided leadership in the Roumanian social organizations in the United States.

The decade 1901-1910 shows the greatest influx of Roumanian immigrants, amounting to 82,210, or an average of 822 annually, of whom 3.5% are from Roumania, 93.1% from Austria-Hungary, and 3.4% from other countries. (See Table II.) The last percentage includes the few Roumanian-Macedonians whose immigration to America began in 1903.[2] The Great War, which held in check the general immigration to the United States, also affected the Roumanian immigration, which in the years 1911-1920 decreased to 54,978 persons, or an average of 5,498 annually (see Table II), of whom the Roumanians from the Old Kingdom formed 4.9%, the Transylvanians 86.9%, and the Macedonians and Roumanians from other countries 8.2%.

The period 1921-1928 registers a further decrease in the

[1] The "immigration from Roumania" for the same period, totalled 138,597 immigrants, of whom 11% were Roumanians, 76% Jews, and 13% of other nationalities. (See Table I.) These figures further substantiate the statement that the bulk of "immigration from Roumania" is Jewish, whereas the majority of the "Roumanian immigrants" have come from Austria-Hungary.

[2] As their numbers, drawn from the pre-war boundaries of Greece, Turkey, Bulgaria, Serbia, etc. are very small, they were not separated from the remainder of Roumanians coming from other European countries. The present estimate of the Roumanian-Macedonians does not exceed 1500 for the whole of the United States including the Farsherotes, Meglenites and Macedonians.

Roumanian immigration due undoubtedly to the direct effects of the restrictive legislative measures resorted to by the United States government "to stem the tide of those unfortunates of Europe who desired to come to the so-called 'Land of Promise' in order to escape the misery and burdens which they inherited from the War." [1] In view of the restrictions of the Quota Act of May 19, 1921,[2] extended by the act of May 11, 1922, extended to July 1, 1924, the Roumanian immigration for the years 1921-1924 amounted to only 10,569 people, or an average of 2,642 annually, of whom 79.6% were from Roumania, 0.6% from Austria-Hungary and 19.8% from other countries (see Table II).

The outstanding trait of the Roumanian immigration in this period is this sudden shift in the high percentage of the Roumanians migrating from Roumania, which must be attributed to the change in the political boundaries of the country, whereby, thanks to the Treaty of Versailles, the provinces of Transylvania, Banat and Bukovina were annexed to Roumania. Thus for the first time Transylvanians and Roumanians come into the same political unit, Greater Roumania, and their combined emigration contributed the 8412 Roumanians of that period. It is natural therefore that the republics of Austria and of Hungary, deprived of the major part of their Roumanian population, should contribute only six-tenths of one per cent of the total Roumanian immigration for the years 1921-1924.

During the period of 1925 to 1928 further restrictions following the enforcement of the immigration act of 1924 [3]

[1] See Garis, R. L., *Immigration Restriction*, New York, 1927, p. 142.

[2] Garis, R. L., *op. cit.*, p. 143. This act provided for a limitation of 3% of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States Census of 1910. The annual quota allotted was 7,419.

[3] Garis, R. L., *op. cit.*, p. 171. This act provided for a limitation of 2% of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in United States as determined by the United States Census of 1890. The annual quota allotted to Roumania is 603 (see *op. cit.*, p. 260).

cause an abrupt decrease in the Roumanian immigration, which fell to 1575. Of these, 61.3% came from Greater Roumania, 0.2% from Austria and Hungary, and 38.5% from other countries. (See Table II.)

EMIGRATION

So far we have dealt only with the number of admitted aliens. But this does not represent the Roumanian population in the United States, for together with the incoming tide there was a counter-current of departing Roumanians. It is impossible to evaluate the total volume of the Roumanian emigration from America because up to 1908 " it was tacitly assumed that our immigration traffic was a wholly one-sided one." [1] But such figures as are recorded since 1908 show that 68,965 Roumanian immigrants returned home in the period 1908-1928. (See Table III.)

TABLE III

IMMIGRANT ALIENS ADMITTED TO UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AND EMIGRANT ALIENS DEPARTING, BY RACE, OR PEOPLE, 1899-1928 [2]

Years	Race—Roumanians		Excess of Immigration over Emigration
	Admitted	Departed	
1899–1900	494		
1901–1907 [3]	50,341		
1908–1910 [3]	31,869	8,450	23,419
1911–1920	54,978	40,756	14,222
1921–1924 [3]	10,569	15,005	—4,436
1925–1928 [3]	1,575	4,754	—3,179
Grand Total 1898–1928	149,826 [1]		
Total 1908–1928	98,991	68,965	30,026

[1] Fairchild, H. P., *Immigration*, New York, 1923, p. 124.

[2] Computed from *Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration*, 1899-1928.

[3] For the inequality of class intervals consult footnote 3 of Table I.

The causes underlying this outgoing movement were numerous and they varied according to circumstances and to the individuals. At times it was economic success which fired the Roumanians with a desire to take back to their native villages the savings of hard years of labor and to show to their countrymen the result of persevering work. Often also the industrial recessions in the United States, such as those of 1907 and 1911, served to make Roumanians return in order to escape unemployment and to preserve the savings which would have been exhausted during such periods. More often the prospect of a quiet old age in the old country, far from the din of industry, or the psychological ties of personal attachment to wives, sweethearts or aged parents affected the current of emigration. To these causes must be added the exceptional prosperity of Roumanian workers in America following the great rise in wages in the war and post-war periods, which allowed them to accumulate considerable savings; and the contributory causes resulting from conditions in the country of origin, such as: (1) the deflation of Roumanian currency which turned into millions of lei the savings in dollars; (2) the Agrarian Reforms of 1919 and 1921 of Greater Roumania,[1] which allowed the peasants to buy part of the land previously owned by the nobility.

These various causes, acting either separately or concurrently, contributed to bringing the number of departing Roumanians up to 68,965 for the period 1908-1928. (See Table III.) By deducting these departures from the total number of Roumanian immigrants for the same period we see that the increment is offset by two-thirds. This considerable volume of emigration indicates that the Roumanian immigration is largely of a temporary character. One cannot foretell whether in the coming years the emigration of

[1] Rommenhoeller, C. G., *op. cit.*, p. 176.

the Roumanians will either exceed or counter-balance their immigration and whether the present Roumanian population in the United States will decrease or remain stable. It is quite obvious that the restrictive legislation which has cut the yearly quota of Roumanians to 603 does not allow for a considerable increase of Roumanians through immigration. As for emigration, it will be wholly controlled by psychological factors which will either draw back to the native country those who have more sympathy with the old culture or will root more deeply in the United States those who have outgrown the social environment of their native land and have better adapted themselves to the new.[1] It has already been held in check by the uncertainty of European conditions, the threat of the Bolshevik invasion of Roumania; the unstabilized currency which paralyzed business; the low money wages in comparison with those in the United States; and the difference in the standards of living.

NUMBER AND COMPOSITION OF THE ROUMANIAN IMMIGRANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

It cannot be ascertained from the data of the annual reports of the Commissioner of Immigration what the actual Roumanian population of the United States is, for we have seen already that the emigration was not recorded prior to 1908.[2]

[1] The Chicago Roumanian colony portrays the situation in regard to the trend of emigration. Only 18 families out of 100 declared definitely that they were contemplating a return home; 19 gave evasive answers on account of the unsettled conditions in Europe and 63 asserted an intention of permanent settlement in the United States.

[2] To obtain an accurate estimate we should deduct from the sum total of arriving immigrants not only the total volume of emigration but also the number of deaths occurring through the period 1899-1928 and the number of deported cases. But as the death records on the basis of race are not available and the few Roumanian cases of deportation are lost among those of the Austro-Hungarians, the Turks and the Greeks, such computation is not possible.

The United States Census gives us the best picture of the total number of the Roumanians in the United States. According to the fourteenth census of 1920 there were 102,823 foreign-born people who have declared Roumania as their country of last residence. (See Table IV.)

TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FOREIGN-BORN POPULATION FROM ROUMANIA, BY PRINCIPAL MOTHER TONGUES, 1920

Mother Tongue	Foreign-born 1920 [1]	Per cent Distribution 1920
Roumanian	51,682	50.3
Yiddish or Hebrew	37,287	36.3
German	8,167	7.9
Magyar	2,606	2.5
All Others	3,081	3.0
Total Foreign-born from Roumania	102,823	100.0

The racial classification of these immigrants on the basis of their mother tongue discloses that 50.3% were Roumanians, 36.3% Jews, 7.9% Germans, 2.5% Magyars, and 3.0% belonged to other races.[2] The 51,682 Roumanians (see

[1] From *United States Census,* 1920, vol. ii, pp. 973. Figures refer to Post-War Roumania.

[2] The percentages of these racial groups seem at first slightly misleading for throughout the analysis of the annual reports of the Commissioner of Immigration we have seen that the Roumanians from Roumania seldom reached 10% of the total emigration from that country. But the census figures for 1920 refer to the post-war boundaries of Roumania. Consequently if we wish to establish a comparison as to race between the census figures and those from the annual reports of the Commissioner of Immigration we need to bring both of them within the same geographical area, Greater Roumania. By combining the data of the annual reports to include both the number of immigrants from Roumania and the Roumanian immigrants from the former provinces of Austria-Hungary, we find that their percentages bear some analogy to those of the Census figures. (See following table.)

Table IV) figuring in the Census data do not include the Roumanian-Macedonians or other Roumanians emigrating from other countries. The classification of the immigrants by mother tongue (grouping the foreign population irrespective of citizenship and country of origin) brings the total number of foreign-born Roumanians to 62,336, and the total number of Roumanians and their children, born in the United States, to 91,683. (See Table V.)

We will consider this figure as more adequately representing the total Roumanian population in the United States. Incidentally it approximates the rough estimate of 100,000 given by the Roumanian leaders and by Mr. Drutzu.[1]

In respect to the composition of these Roumanian immigrants we have fallen back on the figures of the Annual Reports on Immigration because there are no Census data available in regard to the sex, age, conjugal conditions, religion and occupation of each racial group. In other words, we deal with the number of arriving immigrants and not with the actual Roumanian population in the United States.

ROUMANIAN IMMIGRANT ALIENS ADMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES FROM GEOGRAPHICAL TERRITORY CORRESPONDING TO PRESENT DAY GREATER-ROUMANIA (POST-WAR BOUNDARIES) 1899-1928 [a]

Years	Immigrant Aliens Admitted to United States		Per cent Distribution	
1899–1928.	Roumanians from Roumania (Old Kingdom)	15,304	5.8	or 53.3 %
	Roumanians from Transcarparthian Provinces (formerly Austria-Hungary)	124,637	47.5	
	Roumanian Jews	105,214	39.9	
	Other Races	18,079	6.8	
	Total number	263,227	100.0	

[a] Computed from the *Annual Reports* of the Commissioner General of Immigration. These figures do not tally with those taken from the United States Census, Table V.

[1] See Drutzu, S., *op. cit.*, p. 32; Fairchild's *Immigration*, p. 190.

TABLE V

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF THE ROUMANIANS IN THE UNITED STATES, BY NATIVITY AND MOTHER TONGUE, 1920

Country of Origin	Total Roumanian Population in the United States of America according to Mother Tongue
Roumania	71,805
Hungary	10,819
Austria	7,241
Russia	484
Turkey (Europe)	416
Greece	209
Turkey (Asia Minor)	97
Bulgaria	68
Serbia	65
Other Countries	125
Mixed Parentage	354
Total	91,683
Foreign born	62,336
Native white of foreign born or mixed parentage	29,367

Compiled from the *United States Census*, 1920, vol. ii, pp. 973, 976.

COMPOSITION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ROUMANIAN IMMIGRANTS AT THE TIME OF ENTRY

Sex

An examination of the sex distribution as it figures in the annual reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration, for the period 1899-1928, shows that more Roumanian men than women came to the United States. Of a total of 149,826 admitted immigrants, 83.4% were men and 16.6% women. (See Table VI.) The predominance of men in the early period of immigration is still more noticeable, the men forming 91.0% of the total number of arrivals for the years 1899-1910. This is probably due to the temporary or provisional character of the Roumanian immigration. It was

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF ROUMANIAN IMMIGRANT ALIENS ADMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES BY SEX, AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION, 1899-1928

Years	Roumanian Aliens Admitted by Sex			Per cent Distribution		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
1899–1910.....	82,704	75,238	7,466	100.0	91.0	9.0
1911–1920.....	54,974	43,601	11,377	100.0	79.3	20.7
1921–1928.....	12,144	6,076	6,068	100.0	50.0	50.0
Total Number of Roumanian Immigrants Admitted...	149,826	124,915	24,911	100.0	83.4	16.6

not so much the hardships encountered by the pioneers, the making of first contacts, the uncertainty of finding immediate employment, which led the men to emigrate alone, as it was their expectation of returning home in the shortest possible time. Only a few Roumanian women accompanied the men, their number not exceeding 9.0% of the Roumanian immigration up to 1910. But after a period of trial on the part of the men who realized that even in this promised land money-making was not such a rapid process, but necessitated a longer sojourn in the United States, and not wishing to endure loneliness the women began joining the men in greater numbers. The percentage of women reached 20.7% in the decade 1911-1920. (See Table VI.) In the period 1921-1928 the two sexes were equally represented in Roumanian immigration.

But the phenomenon of the male predominance is not peculiar to Roumanian immigration. Professor Fairchild considers it a natural one, for "the first emigration from a region is always an emigration of men" [1] because the men

[1] Fairchild, H. P., *op. cit.*, p. 190.

"have the necessary hardihood and daring to a greater extent than women and are much better fitted by nature for the work of pioneering." A comparison of the sex distribution of different nationalities for the period 1899-1928 shows that the excess of males over females is common among the

TABLE VII

PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF ROUMANIAN IMMIGRANTS, BY SEX, AND COMPARATIVE FIGURES FOR SOME OF THE "NEW AND OLD" IMMIGRANTS, 1899-1928

Race of admitted Immigrant Aliens	Periods under Consideration								
	1899–1910			1911–1920			1921–1928		
	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females
New Immigrants									
Roumanians	100.0	91.0	9.0	100.0	79.3	20.7	100.0	50.0	50.0
Bulgarians, Serbians and Montenegrins	100.0	95.7	4.3	100.0	89.6	10.4	100.0	52.3	47.7
Greeks	100.0	95.1	4.9	100.0	86.4	13.6	100.0	67.1	32.9
Old Immigrants									
English	100.0	61.5	38.5	100.0	54.1	45.9	100.0	51.9	48.9
Germans	100.0	59.4	40.6	100.0	53.5	46.5	100.0	68.2	31.8
Scandinavians	100.0	61.8	38.2	100.0	62.1	37.9	100.0	63.9	36.1

Computed from the *Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration.*

"new immigrants" as well as the "old", though to a smaller degree for the latter. (See Table VII.) While the number of Roumanian immigrants since 1921 has reached a stage of equilibrium between the sexes, more men than women are leaving the United States. The percentage of outgoing men far exceeds that of emigrant women, being 71.3% as against 18.7% for the women, in the period 1921-

1928. This fact, in consideration of the previous predominance of men, tends progressively to bring about an equilibration of the sexes among those remaining within the country.

At present the predominance of the family group within the United States, as evidenced both by observation and comments of the Roumanian leaders,[1] tends to bring about a stability and sense of permanence, beneficial to the community in general. From the standpoint of assimilation this is highly desirable.

Age

The analysis of the age classification of the Roumanians gives us further evidence that the Roumanian immigration at its beginning was in no sense a family immigration. The number of children throughout the period 1899-1928 represents 5.8% of the total Roumanian immigrants; that of the age group 14 to 44 years, 86.2%, and that of the group over 45 years of age 8.2%. (See Table VIII.) In the period 1899-1910 children below fourteen years of age did not exceed 2.3% of the total Roumanian immigration. The majority of the Roumanian immigrants, or 92.8%, belonged to the age group of 14 to 44 years, while those 45 years and over represented 4.9% of the total. In the period 1911-1920 the percent of children represents 6.8% of the total; that of the class 14 to 44 years reached to 80%, and that of the class 45 years and over 13.2%. Finally in the years 1921-1928 there were 23.9% children, 67.8% adults 16 to 44 years

[1] From the survey of 100 Roumanian families in Chicago, we may be justified in assuming that the family group predominates and the single men are in the minority. Among the 100 households 20 were establishments of single men; men temporarily separated from their families in Roumania; widowed men and women. The remainder were families.

[2] The age limit was changed from 14 to 16 in 1918.

and 8.3% 45 years or over. This is a considerable increase in the youngest group, a marked decrease in the middle-age group and a decidedly smaller proportion in the older. In general, the data concerning the age classification of the Roumanians indicate that the bulk of the immigrants is made

TABLE VIII

NUMBER OF ROUMANIAN IMMIGRANTS ADMITTED, BY SPECIFIED AGE GROUPS AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION, 1899-1928

Years	Roumanian Aliens Admitted in each specified age group				Per cent Distribution			
	Under 14[1]	14–44 yrs.	45 and over	Total	Under 14[2]	14–44 yrs.[2]	45 and over	Total
1899–1910....	1,865	76,875	4,064	82,704	2.3	92.8	4.9	100.0
1911–1920.. .	3,765	43,995	7,218	54,978	6.8	80.0	13.2	100.0
1921–1928....	2,384	8,242	1,018	11,701	23.9	67.8	8.3	100.0
Total	8,514	129,012	12,300	149,826	5.6	86.2	8.2	100.0

up of able-bodied men and women who have come to the United States at the most vigorous period of life and who are qualified for productive labor.

Marital Conditions

The analysis of the data concerning the marital conditions of the Roumanian immigrants corroborates the fact that only in part is the Roumanian immigration a migration of families. By confining ourselves to the decade 1911-1920, for

[1] From *Annual Reports* of the Commissioner General of Immigration. The figures for 1899-1910 are taken from *Report of the Immigration Commission*, vol. iv, p. 25, 1910.

[2] From 1918 on, the age classification of the children changes from under 14 years to under 16 years, and consequently this affects the number and percentages of the above table.

which data are complete,[1] we see that the percentage of married men is always greater than that of married women,[2] whether we consider the able-bodied group, 14 to 44 years of age, in which 70.6% of the men were married, as against 62.8% of the women; or that of the age group 45 years and more, in which the respective percentages were 94.7% for the men as against 61.2% for the women. The difference between the married men and the married women is still greater when we take their ratios. In view of the fact that in this decade the males formed 79.3% of the arriving immigrants and the females only 20.7%, the ratio of married men to married women in the age group 14 to 44 years of age is four to one; that of the age group 45 years and over, eighteen to one. There are three single men to one single woman in the group 45 years of age and over. An interesting fact disclosed by the marital conditions of the Roumanians is the high percentage of arriving widows as compared with that of widowers. This might be due to either the higher longevity of women or to a greater tendency among widows to migrate. The number of divorced persons is negligible.

[1] Information regarding marital conditions was collected for the first time in 1910. We did not consider the period 1921-1928 because from 1925 on the classification as to sex and age was changed. There are only two divisions as to age, one below 16 years of age and one above, and as to the marital conditions of both men and women, they have been combined into one single class.

[2] The higher percentage of married men in comparison to that of married women is another illustration of the fact already mentioned, that the Roumanian immigrants do not migrate in family groups.

Data collected by the Immigration Commission investigating in 1907, disclose similar facts. From the 1,689 Roumanian male employees, reporting complete data, in the manufacturing and mining industries, 45.2% were single, 53.7% married, and 1.1% widowed, as against 27.4% of single women, 68.9% married and 3.8% widowed, from a total of 106 gainfully employed. (See *Abstracts of Reports of the Immigration Commission*, vol. i, 1911, pp. 448, 449.)

Occupations [1]

Looking at the Roumanian immigrants from the standpoint of their previous occupation it is seen that a very small number of them are trained in professions, a few are skilled workers, but the majority belong to the class of unskilled laborers.

That the immigration is primarily agricultural is evidenced by the figures referring to the whole period 1899-1927, according to which 0.4% of those declaring an occupation are professional men, 4.0% skilled workers, 6.6% of other occupations and 89.0% farm laborers and unskilled laborers.[2] (See Table IX.)

In the period 1899-1910, 93.8% of the 75,531 Roumanians declaring an occupation were farm laborers and laborers, 2.7% skilled workers, i. e., mechanics, blacksmiths, tailors, etc., and only 0.2% professional men, the remainder, 3.3%, being divided among other occupations such as bankers, agents, merchants, servants, etc. (See Table IX.) From 1911-1920 there is a slight increase in the professional men and the skilled workers, whose percentages reach 0.4% and 3.2% of the total number declaring an occupation. But the percentage of laborers and farm laborers is still high, reaching 81.8%, while that of the other occupations is 8.2%. For the years 1920 to 1928 there seems to be a considerable change in the types of Roumanian immigrants arriving in the United States. The number of unskilled workers dimin-

[1] For a discussion of the occupations of immigrants after arrival see chapter IV of this book.

[2] Similar results were disclosed by the investigation of the Immigration Commission. From a total of 1,695 Roumanians employed in the manufacturing and mining industries, in 1907, 5.1% were engaged in manufacturing previous to their arrival in the United States, 74.3% were farmers or farm laborers, 10.5% in general labor, 2,9% in trade and 7.2% in other occupations. (See *Abstracts of Reports of Immigration Commission*, vol. i, 1911, p. 361.)

TABLE IX

NUMBER OF ROUMANIAN IMMIGRANTS ADMITTED, BY OCCUPATION, ON THE BASIS OF THOSE DECLARING AN OCCUPATION AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION, 1899-1928

	Profession	Skilled	Farm Labor and Labor	In other Occupations	Total number reporting occupations	No occupation declared (Chil. & wom.)	Total number of arrivals
1899–1910...	160	2,069	70,852	2,470	75,531	7,173	82,704
1911–1920...	185	1,472	39,525	3,675	44,859	10,119	54,978
1921–1927...	263	1,463	1,840	2,312	5,888	6,286	12,144
Total	618	5,004	112,199	8,713	126,278	23,548	149,826
Total Per cent							
1899–1910...	0.2	2.7	93.8	3.3	100.0		
1911–1920...	0.4	3.2	81.2	8.2	100.0		
1921–1928...	4.5	24.7	31.5	39.3	100.0		
	0.4	4.0	89.0	6.6	100.0		

From *Annual Reports of Commissioner General of Immigration*, 1899-1928 inclusive.

ishes to the point of representing only 31.5% of the total number declaring an occupation, whereas that of the professional men and of the skilled workers increases, their respective percentages being 4.5% and 24.7%. But as in this period the number of the arriving Roumanians and those declaring an occupation is exceedingly small (only 5,754 in comparison to the 75,531 for the years 1899-1910 and 44,859 for 1911-1920), the general character of the whole Roumanian immigration is not greatly affected. This majority of unskilled workers among the arriving Roumanians is an interesting fact that we should bear in mind when we come to study the occupations in which they engage after their arrival in the United States.[1]

[1] See chapter IV of this book.

Literacy

So far we have looked at the Roumanian immigrant only from the economic point of view and as a productive factor. But as our main interest lies in the adaptability of the Roumanian to American life we should also give some consideration to his intellectual ability. This is a difficult task, for unless the immigrants are submitted to an intelligence test their mental qualities escape measurement. However, as the immigration laws from 1907 on have been selective by excluding feeble-minded people, idiots, etc., the only test of intellectual capacity is the literacy test, more often called the illiteracy test, which is concerned with the ability of the immigrant to read and write. According to the results obtained from this test 35%, of the Roumanians 14 years of age and over, for the period 1899-1910, could neither read nor write. The percentage of illiteracy decreased to 33.2% in the period 1911-1920 and to 3.5% for the period 1921-1928.[1] (See Table X.)

TABLE X

NUMBER OF ROUMANIANS ADMITTED, 14 YEARS AND OVER AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF ILLITERACY [2]

Years	Total number of Roumanians admitted 14 years and over	Roumanians who could not read or write [2]	Per cent Distribution
1899–1910 [3]	80,839	28,266	35.0
1911–1920	51,213	17,038	33.2
1921–1928	11,302	399	3.5

[1] See Garis, R. L., *Immigration Restriction*, New York, 1927, pp. 104, 111. Constant reference is made to Garis's work as being more recent and more complete than other books on immigration.

[2] Compiled from the *Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration*. The figures for 1899-1910 are taken from the *Abstracts of Reports of the Immigration Commission*, 1911, vol. iii, p. 83.

[3] Includes 48 who could read but not write.

It appears that in this last period Roumanian immigration is superior in quality to that of previous years, both from the standpoint of economic efficiency and educational achievement. But the degree of literacy is in no respect an indication of the intellectual capacity of the immigrant to adapt himself to the exigencies of the new environment. It merely shows what opportunity he had to secure, at home, such a degree of education as is indicated by the ability to read and write. Illiterate people may have latent capacities which may come to the fore when opportunity arises, but this point will be taken up later in considering the effect of the new environment upon the Roumanian immigrants.

Religious Affiliation

From the standpoint of religion the Roumanian immigrants belong to three divisions, the Greek Orthodox Church [1] which claims more than 90,000 [2] of the combined group of Roumanians, Macedonians and Transylvanians; the Greek Catholic Church or Uniate Church [3] which has a member-

[1] The Greek Orthodox Church, according to Article 22, Section 3, of the Constitution of Roumania, is considered the State Church of Roumania, because the majority of the people, over 13,000,000, adhere to it. This Church belongs to the original Orthodox Church whose Sees remained in Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria, at the time of the division of the Christian Church, in 1054, into two main branches: the Greek Orthodox Church or the Church of the Orient (to which the Bulgarians, Greeks, Roumanians, Russians and Serbians belong) and the Roman Catholic Church or the Church of the Occident. (See Rommenhoeller, C. G., *op. cit.*, p. 45.)

[2] These figures have been given by their respective religious leaders. According to the Census of Religious Bodies, in 1926, the Greek Orthodox Church numbered 18,833 members among the Roumanians, but the census does not specify whether they are "communicant members, or all persons, including infants, baptized or confirmed in the church, or parish, members or the families of the congregation, the head of the family being the voting member." See *U. S. Bureau of Census, Census of Religious Bodies*, 1926, Eastern Orthodox Churches, Washington, D. C., 1929, p. 23.)

[3] The Greek Catholic Church of Transylvania was created in 1697,

ship of 1,700 solely among the Transylvanians; the Roumanian Baptist Church [1] which numbers 850 members.

A summary of the outstanding features of the Roumanian immigration to the United States discloses the fact that the majority of the immigrants, the Transylvanians, have come from the provinces ruled in the pre-war period by Austria-Hungary, a few from the old Kingdom and only a small number of Roumanian-Macedonians from Epirus. These Roumanians are a group of able-bodied people, mostly from the peasant class, and in respect to age, sex, marital conditions and occupations, well equipped for productive work. As to the causes which brought this human raw material within the gates of the United States an attempt will be made, in the succeeding chapter, to discover what prompted these people to face the hardship of breaking home ties, of risking their savings and of making the adjustments demanded by the new environment.

when the Prelate Theophilus consented to unite all the Roumanians in Transylvania with the Holy See of Rome, under pressure from the Hungarian authorities. The Transylvanians were "to embrace Catholicism on condition that they retained the rites which were bound up with all their traditions, the ancient icons, the archaic liturgy, the old Roumanian style of the Scriptures and the festivals which their ancestors had celebrated." (See Iorga, N., *A History of Roumania*, New York, 1925, p. 201.)

[1] The Roumanian Baptist Church in Roumania (according to the statement of the Director of the Roumanian Section of the International Baptist Seminary in East Orange, N. J.) was established about 50 years ago, and has a membership of approximately 35,000 members.

CHAPTER III

Home Background of the Roumanian Immigrants

It is difficult to realize the effect of the new environment upon the Roumanian immigrant and the extent to which he has succeeded in identifying himself with the life of the American community, without comparing the two environments in which he has lived and is now living.

It has been already pointed out that the majority of the Roumanian immigrants were of peasant stock. But a picture of their home background is necessary in order to grasp the nature of their psychological reactions once transplanted into the urban industrial centres of the United States.

Dissatisfaction with home conditions and the "attractive force" of the economic prosperity of the New World have been the chief determining factors in the immigration of the Roumanians. In his exhaustive studies of the migratory movements of people Professor Fairchild considers modern migration as "essentially an economic phenomenon." [1] He attributes it to the different levels of prosperity between the country of emigration and that of immigration which produce a sense of dissatisfaction on the part of the would-be emigrant and a desire to relieve discontent by venturing into the promised land of unlimited opportunities. But such an emphasis upon a single set of factors determining the emigration of the Roumanians would necessarily be biased, unless we give full weight and consideration to the whole array of contributory causes as well.

[1] See Fairchild, H. P., *op. cit.*, p. 145.

Though fundamentally similar, home backgrounds slightly differ for the Roumanians, Transylvanians and Roumanian-Macedonians. They must be studied in the light of environmental differences, particularly as affecting the class conditions of these immigrants.

THE ROUMANIAN IMMIGRANTS

Of the total number of Roumanians admitted to the United States, those coming from the Old Kingdom of Roumania, in its pre-war boundaries, did not exceed 5.8%.[1] Whatever may be said regarding the social conditions of the peasant and laboring class, they stand in contrast with those existing in provinces which were under an alien rule and from whence Roumanians migrated in greater numbers. The privileges of wealth, recreation and leisure centered in the hands of the few, the aristocracy and the clergy. In the economic, political and social spheres the laboring classes were inarticulate, passive and non-resistant to the economic pressure which was keeping them on the lowest round of the social ladder. To explain why the situation of the Roumanian peasant or artisan between 1890 and 1914 was precarious, we have to review the preceding historical conditions.

Despite the law of 1864,[2] which abolished serfdom and, allowing the peasants to buy the land they worked on, aimed to create, as in France, a large class of small land owners, few had succeeded in realizing the economic independence which would have meant social freedom. Even when the law first went into effect and 1,600,000 hectars of land were distributed to 400,000 peasant families,[3] the individual family holding did not exceed five hectars. For the first twenty years the inalienability of the land prevented the division of

[1] See Table in footnote, p. 31 *supra*.

[2] Rommenhoeller, C. G., *op. cit.*, p. 26.

[3] Muzet, A., *La Roumanie Nouvelle*, Paris, 1920, p. 211.

the homesteads into smaller units and thus saved the peasants from falling again into the state of economic dependence. But when the inheritance law went into effect, allowing each child an equal share in the inherited property of his parents, the subsequent land division reduced the holdings considerably and gave a deadly stroke to the economic independence of the peasant. Even in years of prosperity the crops were inadequate for the needs of his numerous family. Though nominally a free property holder, the peasant was in fact subject to economic pressure. He was forced to supplement, or even to provide the whole income of his family, either by working the soil of the land owner on the surviving tithing system or by hiring his labor.[1] In the former case he was paid in kind; in the latter, in money.

But spendthrift and improvident, the peasant had easily spent his wages by the end of the harvest season. To meet his expenses throughout the long winter months when labor was scarce on the farms he was forced to undersell his future labor to either the landowner or the tenant. This disadvantageous position of the peasant in regard to his creditors is well illustrated by Mr. Lupu:

Plowing an acre of land in the spring or autumn was paid 8 francs, while in the winter it was paid only 2 francs. As for

[1] The statement of N. P. from Old Roumania, and now a citizen of Philadelphia, is indicative of the conditions which affected the Roumanian peasant: "I had 10 hectars of land in the old country and quite a number of cattle, 20 sheep, a pair of horses and one of oxen, which in 1906 amounted to $1,000. But to support my family of five children I was forced to let my wife work in the fields and myself to go to work for the land owner. By the end of the summer season I would have enough money to pay for the school taxes" (education is free in Roumania, but there is a registration fee of 10 Lei, at the beginning of each school year) "and books of my children. After the Christmas season I would find myself penniless. I had to borrow money from the land owner on the coming season's labor but as nothing is done without profit I only got 70 centimes a day instead of 1.50 francs."

harvesting, by mortgaging his summer work the peasant received only 4 francs per acre for work which in the summer time was worth 16 francs.[1]

To free the peasant from this exploitation and to give him an opportunity to ameliorate his condition by working his own land and making it yield good crops, the Government instituted in 1871 the "Credit Foncier Rural," [2] the "Credit Agricole" in 1899 and the "Banques Populaires" in 1902. In this way the peasants were enabled to borrow money directly from these state institutions at a very low rate in order to buy the seeds, the cattle and the agricultural implements needed for the sowing season. Thanks to this policy, the Government parceled 40.29% of the arable land which belonged to the State through the secularization of the clergy's *latifundia.* But whereas the majority of the rural population, or 99.4%, held less than one-half the arable land, the large proprietors, forming only 0.64% of the agricultural population, held 69.71% of this land. Despite the efforts of the Government and of legislation, the situation of the peasants was not greatly improved; small land holdings, numerous families and inadequate wages kept them at the lowest economic level.

This precarious economic situation of the Roumanian peasant greatly handicapped his political power. It prevented him from using to the benefit of his class the advantages offered by a representative Government in bringing about changes necessitated by new conditions. As the franchise of the amended Constitution of 1884 [3] divided the population of Roumania into three classes of electors, whose representative power differed according to their income and to the

[1] See Lupu, N., *Roumania and the War*, Boston, 1919, p. 84.

[2] See Muzet, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 217-218.

[3] Constitution du 30 Juin (12 Juillet) 1866, avec modifications introduites en 1879—Bucarest, 1884, pp. 41, 42, 44.

amount of taxes paid, the peasants were forced into the third electoral class, which paid the minimum of taxes. Consequently the peasant class had a smaller number of representatives, though numerically it was superior to both the middle class and landed aristocracy. Its political representation was further curtailed by the fact that many peasants were kept out of the polls on account of their illiteracy. Their parents had deemed it preferable to pay the fine for disobedience to the law of compulsory education rather than to deprive the whole family of the labor of its younger members. In view of these shortcomings which were the direct outcome of economic pressure the political power of the Roumanian peasant was almost non-existent. To quote Prof. N. Iorga's statement: "The Roumanian peasant of the Kingdom had not been admitted to a share in its real political life. The few villagers who figured occasionally in the Chamber of Deputies were part of the decorations and the voters of the third college were not free to express their real sympathies." [1]

As to the social status of the Roumanian peasant, it was cramped by the defects inherent in a social structure in which the class divisions, while not as rigid as those of a caste system, helped to maintain the privileges of the minority. The peasant was at the lowest social level out of which only the exceptionally gifted children rose to enlarge the middle-class intelligentsia. He was looked upon as being attached to the soil with little possibility for promotion in the social scale. "Born a peasant, always a peasant," was a commonly accepted axiom of the nobility, the middle class and the peasant himself, who took no action in ameliorating his condition. His educational opportunities seldom went beyond the four years of compulsory education, but even this advantage was derived from the paternalistic attitude of the Government.

It is perhaps due to this fatalistic attitude of the peasant,

[1] Iorga, N., *A History of Roumania*, London, 1925, p. 256.

his natural *laissez-faire* and his belief in a guiding Providence that he himself made little effort to change his conditions. But the impassivity of the peasant towards the existing social order necessitated another outlet for the discontent which his economic situation bred, and this was usually found in migration.

In regard to the craftsmen, tailors, shoemakers, furriers, mechanics, etc., they were not better off than the peasants. Large industries were still undeveloped in Roumania. Home industry deprived the craftsmen of their largest clientele, the peasants, who were adequately providing for their own needs. Not only did they weave the cloth necessary for their garments but they were building their homes, making their furniture, weaving carpets, carving utensils for the household, etc. Thus the craftsmen were forced to gather in the cities and to cater only to the small population of city dwellers (15% of the total population). Often the supply of their labor exceeded the demand and resulted in small earnings. The taxes paid to the communes (municipalities) and to the craft corporations were over-burdening the average craftsman, who also had to put up with seasonal fluctuation in such industries as clothing, building, etc. Under these circumstances the situation of the Roumanian craftsman was no more flourishing than that of the peasant.[1]

But along with these environmental conditions there were subjective motives which gave the ultimate spur to emigration. If economic causes forced the Roumanian peasant and craftsman from Wallachia and Dobroudja to migrate to the United States, such were not the only motives of the Roumanians who came from Oltenia, the homeland of the wealthiest and most enterprising among the Roumanian peasants.

[1] Consult on this subject: Xenopol, A. D., *Histoire des Roumains de la Dacie Trajane,* 2 vols., Paris, 1896; Iorga, N., *Geschichte des rumänischen Volkes im Rahmen seiner Staatsbildungen,* 2 vols., Gotha, 1905; and Martonne, Emmanuel de, *La Valachie,* Paris, 1902.

Their migration must be attributed equally to their personal intrepidity and to their adaptability to changing environments. Thanks to his natural daring and shrewdness, to his mercantile spirit, which causes him to leave his land and family in the summer season and to roam through the country selling fresh vegetables and fruit, the Oltean has acquired through the daily give-and-take of small trade the art of dealing with people and of adapting himself to new circumstances without feeling overcome, like a majority of the other peasants, by the determinism of events. Accustomed to this regular seasonal migration, the Oltean took the road to America with a spirit of adventure. It is also possible that in his wanderings from city to city he was influenced by the stories heard about America.[1]

In summing up the causes which led to the Roumanian emigration we see that they have been both psychological and cultural, conditioned by economic circumstances, and that no political or religious persecutions have influenced the Roumanians who have come to the United States.

THE TRANSYLVANIAN IMMIGRANTS

The causes underlying the emigration of the peasants from Transylvania are more complex. In addition to the psychological motives, influenced by social and economic circumstances, there is also to be considered the tense political situation in which they lived. Their homes were on the western slopes of the Carpathian Mountains, thus bringing them under the Austro-Hungarian rule. As subjects of the Dual Empire they were supposed to enjoy the privileges of free-

[1] The following story was told to the writer by P. V., established in Philadelphia: "In the summer of 1906, while selling fruit in Braila, I heard a Roumanian Jewish woman relate with great enthusiasm the rapid way in which a relative of hers made a fortune by keeping a restaurant in Philadelphia. From that day on the word 'Philadelphia' kept ringing in my ears until I found myself walking in the streets of West Philadelphia searching for employment."

dom of religion and of language guaranteed by the Law of Nationalities of 1868.[1] But as this law was never respected by the Hungarians, the fate of the Roumanians, whose claims to an autonomous government under the direct rule of Austria Francis Joseph had disregarded by accepting the Ausgleich of 1867, was left to the discretion of the Magyar administration.

Departing from the liberal policy[2] of the Habsburg dynasty, the Hungarian Diet pursued a policy of strong Magyarization. Not daring openly to contradict the Law of Nationalities of 1868, it resorted to a series of intricate measures which created a great deal of dissatisfaction and suffering among the Transylvanians. The latter saw their electoral freedom curtailed by high taxes and still more by the iniquitous class system of taxation. They had to pay four times the amount of taxation levied on the Szeklers, the Swabs or the Hungarians living in the other electoral districts. Their political representatives were reduced in numbers despite their numerical predominance. Their national solidarity was broken by the arbitrary electoral divisions which scattered them among the neighboring districts and grouped them either with the Magyars or the Sasii.[3] Free voting was not possible, because an armed force was used

[1] Cabot, J. Moors, *The Racial Conflict in Transylvania*, Boston, 1926, p. 15.

[2] Transylvania became an autonomous province in the Austrian Empire at the Peace of Szatmar in 1711 and maintained its privileges, including religious tolerance, from 1711 to 1848. (See J. Moors Cabot, *op. cit.*, p. 12.) But Professor Iorga dissents on the liberal policy of the Habsburgs and speaks of them as "the small-minded and suspicious Austrians." (See Iorga, N., *A History of Roumania*, London, 1925, p. 222.)

[3] The name "Sas" (plural Sasii, pronounced Sashee) is given to the Germans and Franks from Moselle, Aix-la-Chapelle, Luxembourg, Treves and Metz, whom the Hungarian king Geisa called to colonize Transylvania, about the middle of the twelfth century. They established

often in time of elections to aid the Magyar candidate and to eliminate the Roumanian.[1] Further to control public opinion not only through political channels but also through the press, the Law of 1893, Article 13,[2] was passed, which granted the King's attorney the right to attack a journalist whenever he published an article of protest which threatened the unity of the national Magyar State. Thanks to this law, 367 Roumanian journalists were accused and imprisoned during a period of twenty-two years, from 1886 to 1908. Pushing the Magyarization policy a step further, the Hungarian Government undertook to impose its language upon the Roumanian schools, which up to 1905 had received no state subsidy, though there were almost 4,000,000[3] Roumanian taxpayers.

The law of Trefort in 1879 required the Roumanian teachers to learn the Magyar language within six years in order to teach all the classes of the Roumanian primary schools in Hungarian. The Law of 1883 imposed the Hungarian language on the primary schools. That of 1891 made it compulsory for even the kindergarten schools. These series of laws[4] enacted by the Hungarian Diet contributed to exasperate the Transylvanians.

in the districts of Hermannstadt (now Sibin) Kronstadt (now Brashov) Schaessburg (now Reginul Sasesc) in Transylvania and they went even into the territory of the old Kingdom of Roumania, the provinces of Olt, Bistritza, Suceava and so on. (See Rommenhoeller, C. C., *op. cit.*, p. 87 also Muresanu, J., *Ardealul*, Bucarest, Cartea Romaneasca, p. 289.)

[1] See Draghicescu, *Les Problemes Nationaux de L'Autriche-Hongrie*, Paris, 1918, p. 121; also Iorga, N., *A History of Roumania*, New York, 1925, p. 256; Brote, E., *La questione Rumenè in Transilvania ed Ungheria*, Torino, 1896; and Seton-Watson, R. W., *Corruption and Reform in Hungary*, London, 1911.

[2] See Mitrany, B., *Roumania, her History and Politics*, Oxford pamphlets, 1914-1915, p. 33, and Scotus Viator, *Political Persecution in Hungary*, London, 1908, p. 4.

[3] See Draghicescu, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

[4] See Draghicescu, *op. cit.*, p. 104, also Seton-Watson, R. W., *Corruption and Reform in Hungary*, London, 1911.

Never before had they suffered such a stifling of their national aspirations, not even when in 1697, following the submission of Transylvania to the Habsburgs, the Roman Catholic propaganda led by the Jesuit Paul Beranyi [3] resorted to religious conversions as a method of assimilating the different elements of the empire and of strengthening the power of the Church by identifying it with that of the State.

In the reaction to this policy of forced assimilation the Transylvanians created in 1881 the National Roumanian Party of Hungary, which demanded, first, the autonomy of Transylvania; second, the use of the Roumanian language in administration, and justice in the counties inhabited by the Roumanians; third, the appointment of Roumanian officials in these counties or of Hungarian officials who could speak Roumanian; fourth, the religious and cultural autonomy and a State subsidy for Roumanian schools; fifth, the curtailment of the Magyarization policy.[2] But despite its efforts the National Roumanian Party failed to have its claims recognized by the Hungarian government. The situation of the Transylvanians became so tense that the students of Roumania addressed to Francis Joseph a memorandum in which they protested on behalf of the intellectuals against the sufferings of the Transylvanians caused by the Hungarian administration. The Emperor rejected the memorandum on the intervention and protest of the Hungarian magnates and the Roumanians continued to be exposed to the ill-treatment of their rulers. For every trifle they were penalized with the payment of high fines. In case they failed to produce the money they were imprisoned. To avoid such a tax on personal dignity the Transylvanians, whose means

[1] See Iorga, N., *A History of Roumania*, London, 1925, p. 201 *et seq.*, also Draghicescu, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

[2] See Draghicescu, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

were extremely limited, had to open their common purses in order to set their brothers free. In this manifestation of mutual help and patriotic solidarity the Transylvanians lost their savings. Their economic conditions were so seriously impaired that many were forced to leave Austria-Hungary.[1]

Commenting upon the whole political machinery of the Hungarian Government, Mr. Draghicescu writes: "This administration was so deprived of scruples and so abusive that the Roumanians could stand it no longer and migrated in masses. Whole villages were turned into deserts. The population was forced to expatriate and went to the United States of America." [2] Political pressure has undoubtedly contributed much in creating an atmosphere which breeds discontent and dissatisfaction, but Mr. Draghicescu's statement seems one-sided because it overlooks the economic causes which influenced not only the Transylvanian immigration to the United States, but also that which brought to the old Kingdom of Roumania in the years 1899 to 1913, 102,378 Transylvanians.[3]

Except for the few intellectuals who were politically persecuted, this latter Transylvanian immigration was partly per-

[1] A typical example in point is the case of M. P., at present in Trenton, N. J., formerly of Satmar. Seeing that all the savings of his father and brothers went to liberate the political prisoners of his district he came to the United States to save his family from the clutches of poverty.

"I engaged myself as a farm laborer in upper New York State. After two years of hard labor I saved $300, with which I first brought my father and brother. All three of us stayed on the farm until we saved enough money to rent a farm of our own. In time the need of more help on the farm, together with a surplus of savings, allowed us to bring the whole family here and thus we all escaped the years of dark misery that would have confronted us had we stayed in Austria-Hungary."

[2] Draghicescu, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

[3] See: *Les Publications Statistiques Hongroises, Nouvelle Series*, vol. 67, also *Buletinul Muncei*, Bucuresti, year six, No. 6789, June, July, August and September, 1925, both official governmental publications.

manent and partly seasonal. It brought into Roumania peasants to whom the Roumanian Government gave grants of land, and also men and women who came in the winter months to sell their homespun products or to engage themselves as domestic servants, cooks, truck drivers, coachmen, shepherds, etc., and who in the summer time returned to Transylvania to harvest their crops. In view of the fact that the Transylvanian immigration to America was partly a temporary one and that to Roumania a semi-seasonal one, it appears that both economic and political causes were powerful in motivating both of them.

The economic situation of the Transylvanian peasants was highly unsatisfactory.[1] Political pressure, small wages and the general economic depression in Austria-Hungary kept it at a low level. Only a few of the Transylvanian peasants held property. They benefited but little from the series of reforms which aimed at parceling the land among the peasants, such as "The abolition of serfdom in 1783, under Joseph the Second, the doing away of the Fief system in land tenure in 1848 and the privilege of subdividing the peasant holdings in 1869."[2] The Hungarian State in its efforts to protect its own nationals left the less productive land to the Transylvanians. Whenever opportunity arose it bought all available land and offered it at very advantageous prices to the Hungarians to the exclusion of the Transylvanians. Thus in 1893, 1896, 1899 and 1900 the Government helped the Hungarians[3] to settle in the districts of Banat, Carrash-Severin, Sameshul, Mare, Cojocana, Vitza and Faget. The inferior quality of land held by the Transylvanians yielded insufficient crops. To meet their needs the members of the family were forced to hire their labor. But even so their economic

[1] See: Gonnard, R., *La Hongrie au XX^e siècle*, Paris, 1908, pp. 219-221.

[2] See: *The Report of the Immigration Commission*, 1911, vol. iv, p. 367.

[3] From Draghicescu, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

status was not greatly improved on account of the exceedingly low wages.[1] These wages were due to the superabundance of manual labor in agriculture,[2] to the backward state of industrial development in Hungary, and to the general economic depression reigning throughout Austria-Hungary. As a direct result of this general economic depression the Transylvanian peasants were forced to borrow money and to mortgage their small land holdings. Often the interest due was so heavy that the peasants were forced to sell their properties and to become domestic servants.[3] This precarious economic situation further influenced their social status by preventing many of the Transylvanians from attending school and forcing them to accept the most menial jobs, which led to disdain and disregard on the part of the Hungarians. Economic pressure hardened the Transylvanian peasant and embittered his feelings. He objected not so much to the many privations which kept him on the threshold of poverty, as to the fact that his neighbors, the Germans and Szeklers, were better treated by the Hungarians and were in a flourishing economic state.

[1] The average daily wage of farm laborers as reported by the Hungarian statistical year book for 1905 was 22 cents for the men, 14 cents for the women and 10 cents for the children, including their food. Without the food these wages were 31 cents for the men, 21 cents for the women and 15 cents for the children. The average daily wage of all walks in life was 2½ crowns or about 51 cents per diem, whereas the earning capacity of a worker in the United States was estimated at $1.00, if not more. (See *Report of Immigration Commission,* vol. iv, 1911, p. 361.)

[2] Only 14.4% of the Hungarian population in 1900 were dependent upon industry and mining, whereas 68.4% drew its resources from its work of the soil. (See *Report of Immigration Commission,* 1911, vol. iv, p. 362.)

[3] Said Mrs. P., now in Chicago: "Our old homestead for which my parents had worked so hard, threatened to fall into the hands of the Hungarians because of the heavy mortgage which encumbered it. Despite my husband's work, and my own as a domestic servant in the winter months, we could not pay the interest due so we decided to come to America, where within a very short period we were able to earn enough money to pay our debts and thus to free our old patrimony."

Aside from these political economic causes underlying the Transylvanian emigration, the economic pull of the United States, fully described by the steamship companies, together with the contents of letters that the first Hungarian settlers wrote to their relatives at home became the chief topic of interest in village conversation. The alluring pictures of working conditions and of wages in America spread from the Hungarians to the Roumanians, and fired them with a desire to go to the promised land and encouraged them to break away from the home community in order to seek a fortune.

But all these causes together would have been ineffective were they not supported by some elements in the character of the Transylvanian peasant. Unlike his passive, fatalistic Roumanian brother, he is known for his daring and his spirit of independence which he holds as a sacred heritage from his ancestors. Faithful to the tradition of G. Doja, Horia, Crishan, Closhca, and Avram Iancu, themselves peasants who in 1514, 1784 and 1848 led the revolt of their countrymen in their struggle for independence, the Transylvanians continued to brave obstacles instead of being overcome by them. Despite their long-drawn struggle for equality of opportunities, or perhaps on its account, they have a keener sense of their rights and they fight more perseveringly for them. The example of their neighbors, the Germans and the Slavs, with their semi-home rule and their prosperity, must have been a constant stimulus to their own aspirations for political and social freedom and for higher standards of living.[1]

[1] "I was tired", said J. O., living at present in Detroit, formerly from Banata, "of sleeping in the barn with the oxen and sheep in order to keep warm throughout the long winter months. I did not mind the hay stack as a bed in the summer time nor the starry sky as my roof, but I longed to have a home of my own in which to shelter my old parents, a home like those of the Germans our neighbors, and to command the respect of the community."

It is due to this daring spirit that the Transylvanians reacting to the causes which create dissatisfaction, decided to leave for the United States.

THE ROUMANIAN-MACEDONIAN IMMIGRANTS

The reasons for the Roumanian-Macedonian immigration to the United States are more directly connected with the economic situation prevailing in Macedonia and the psychological impulse which influenced the individual in planning a new adventure, rather than in the discontent arising from either political or social pressure. Unlike the Transylvanians who suffered from the Magyarization policy of their rulers, the Roumanian-Macedonian subjects of the Sultan of Constantinople had little reason to complain about the Turkish administration. Throughout the centuries of their subjection to the Turks they enjoyed, more than the other Christians of the Empire, the privileges granted to them by the special capitulation [1] in the reign of Murad the Second.[2] Up to the nineteenth century they kept a kind of home rule. They had the right to administer justice by their own "councils of wisdom" (made up of their chiefs and high officials), to keep a guard at the frontiers and to exercise their own police power within their villages. They were even exempt from general taxation, paying only an annual tribute [3] as a token of their vassalage. When at the beginning of the nineteenth century the capitulation was withdrawn for administrative reasons, the Roumanian-Macedonians still continued to enjoy the privileges of practicing their religion freely, of making use of their own language, and of pursuing the development of their ethnic culture in schools kept

[1] See Pouqueville, F. C. H. L., *Voyage dans la Grece*, Paris, 1826-1827, p. 159.

[2] He reigned from 1422 to 1451.

[3] See Papahagi, T., *Les Roumains de Turquie*, Bucarest, Imprimerie Eminesco, pp. 31 and 34 (date not given).

at the expense of local communities. Even the military service was not a heavy burden.

The oldest son, as well as only sons, were altogether exempt because they were considered the natural bread-winners of the family and the protectors of the women, who very seldom worked outside the household. Those who wanted to avoid it had always the possibility of paying to the Turkish Government a tax, which varied according to the means of the individual. On the whole, political pressure was non-existent.[1] Nor was the social status of the Roumanian-Macedonians so low in comparison with their neighbors, the Greeks, the Bulgarians, the Montenegrins, etc., as to create among them the deep dissatisfaction arising from a sense of social inferiority. The only drawback in this connection was the strong footing that the Greeks had in some of the localities where the Roumanian-Macedonians lived, such as Avlona, Ghevgheli, Moschopolis. Taking advantage of their numerical superiority and their higher monetary contributions to the school funds, the Greeks were carrying the whole school program in Greek, without taking into consideration the demands of the Roumanian-Macedonian contributors for the teaching of their own language. But even this disadvantage of witnessing Roumanian-Macedonian children brought up in the Greek language was greatly overcome by the subsidy that the Roumanian Government granted to the Macedonians, enabling them to open their own schools, which numbered ninety by 1897.[2]

[1] "If it were not for the change in Government", said one of the Roumanian-Macedonians in New York City, "you would not have found us here (meaning the United States). We would have returned after the war to our home villages because we never had to complain about the Turks. They treated us with decency and respect, whereas the present-day Greek Government, pursuing a strong policy of Hellenization, has smitten our hopes of a return home and has forced us to bring our families here in order to give our children the opportunity of education that they cannot pursue in their own language at home."

[2] See Iorga, N., *Histoire des Roumains de la Peninsule Balkanique*, Bucarest, 1919, p. 56.

But the general economic conditions of the Macedonians, as judged from the natural resources of the country and occupations of its inhabitants, were such as to create a need for seeking additional resources in more fertile regions in order to supplement the paucity of those at home. Gone was the prosperity of Moschopolis, which in the seventeenth century was considered the most flourishing city, thanks to its trade with Venice [1] in woolen goods and leather. Gone also was the wealth of the Aroumanian mountaineers who had " big and innumerable herds of sheep, goats, horses, oxen and cows covering all the mountains of Pindus and the whole peninsula." [2] The aridity of the soil did not foster agricultural pursuits except in the region of Meglen. The main occupations of the Roumanian-Macedonians were cattle-breeding, the wool industry, the crafts of tailoring and leather-curing, some small commercial enterprises, and the convoying of passengers or of freight. The Roumanian-Macedonians of the Pindus were chiefly shepherds [3] from Crushova, Gopesi and around Monastir and Bitolia, and craftsmen or tradesmen. The Farsheriotes, or Farshilotes [4] from Albania were considered the most daring of nomads. Only the Meglenoroumanians living in the fertile district of Meglen, extending from Vodena to Vardar, enjoyed some

[1] See Iorga, N., *op. cit.*, p. 38.

[2] Translated from Papahagi, T., *Antologia Aromana*, Bucarest, 1922, p. xxi.

[3] See Iorga, N., *Histoire des Roumains de la Peninsule Balkanique*, p. 60.

[4] From Rubin, A., *Les Roumains de Macedoine—Bucarest*, 1913, p. 63. According to the author the name of " Farshilotes " comes from the village of Frashari in Albania, but according to another version it belongs to Pharsale. On the basis of this assertion it is claimed that the Farshilotes, who are also called Pharsalotes have occupied the mountains of Thessaly and Pindus for many centuries, and that it is not presumptuous to believe that they are the remnants of the Army of Pompey defeated by Caesar.

economic prosperity because they were engaged in a diversity of lucrative occupations. They practiced agriculture and industry, which varied from tailoring, horseshoeing, blacksmithing and pottery to cattle-breeding, the raising of silkworms, the rearing of bees, and the cultivation of fruits and nuts. The women were most laboriously engaged at work to contribute their share to the income of the family. They were either helping the men in the fields or they were engaged in the home industries, such as knitting socks, embroidering or weaving carpets and cloth. But despite this additional help, except for the relative economic prosperity of the Meglenoroumanians, the general income of the Roumanian-Macedonian family was far from adequate. These people were always exposed to incursions of bands of Commitadjis, Greeks, Bulgarians and Serbians, who were preying upon them and subjecting them to many privations. The men found themselves obliged to travel from Salonika to Serres, Drama, Constantinople, and even Roumania and Russia, in order to find an outlet for the home industries, a market for their cattle, or other employment. Spurred by the economic pressure at home, they had developed mercantile tendencies which brought them to explore " in length and in breadth the whole Balkan Peninsula from the south of Greece to Bosnia and Budapest and from the shores of the Adriatic and Ionic Seas to Constantinople and Iassy." [1] America seemed but another and a very logical step.[2]

No one has better depicted these migratory tendencies of the Roumanian-Macedonians than one of their writers: " Just as the mountains dominate the plains or fields, thus

[1] Translated from Papahagi, T., *op. cit.*, p. xxii.

[2] "Accustomed to leaving my family", said one of the Macedonians at present living in Worcester, Mass., " for more than two to three years, even pushing as far as Roumania and Russia, it made no difference to me to take a step further and to go as far as America, the country of the mighty dollar."

with the Aroumanian; he is the one who roams the plains and fields inhabited by other nations; he investigates their whole social and economic life, utilizing it to his advantage; he spreads his scrutinizing antenna even beyond his ethnic cradle to the flowery shores of the seas, and there, like the spider which from the leaf in the midst of the water stretches his cobweb towards the tree, making out of it a bridge, he establishes between these new centers of economic life and the mountainous regions of his birth a continuous communication." [1]

From the presentation of the home backgrounds of the Roumanians, Transylvanians and Roumanian-Macedonians we have gathered an idea of the hardships and limited opportunities that they had in their native villages and of the motives which have decided them to migrate to America. The latter are primarily of a psychological nature, as is the case with all those immigrants whose daring to break away from set habits and to face the unknown with unflinching courage, make possible their adjustment to a new environment.

[1] Translated from Papahagi, T., *op. cit.*, p. xvi.

CHAPTER IV

The Distribution of the Roumanian Immigrants in the United States

URBAN, RURAL, REGIONAL, OCCUPATIONAL

The striking feature in the distribution of the Roumanians throughout the United States is their concentration in the cities. Despite the fact that 83.7% of the arriving Roumanians are farm laborers or laborers belonging to the peasant class, only 9% of them have settled in the rural districts. The majority of them, or 91%, are living in the cities. Their urban concentration has been less the result of their personal choice than the direct outcome of circumstances which forced them to break away from their traditional occupation and environment and to enter the industrial field.

When eleven of us landed in New York in 1902 [said Mr. B. of Indiana Harbor, Indiana] we met an agent right at the steamer's gang-plank. He spoke Roumanian, mixed with a few words of German. He offered to employ us at $9.00 a week at the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company in Garrett, Indiana. He assured us that we would have our wages paid regularly every week and in case we were willing to go to Garrett he would put us on the train and have us met at the place of our destination. With such offers he seemed like a God-send to us. None of us spoke English and we had only a smattering of German and Hungarian. We had no idea as to the kind of work we might get. We had only heard that many Hungarians were working in Chicago at the stock yards and we were heading for there when we arrived at Castle Garden; but as the agent was

willing to engage us at once we accepted his offer in order not to break our group and so we all went to Garrett, where we found immediate employment.

A totally different picture is given by the narrative of Mr. V. from Satmar, now living near Trenton, N. J.:

In 1903 [said he] I came with three other Transylvanians, whom I met on board ship. They were coming to join friends in Cleveland and they tried to induce me to follow them but when we reached New York I left them. I had in mind to remain a farmer and I wanted to learn the American methods of agriculture. I had only $5 in my pocket so that I could not think of renting a farm. I did not know English but with my small vocabulary in German I tried to find work on a farm. Quite by chance I met an American farmer who had come to the city to attend to his business. He was willing to take me at $180 a year [1] and maintenance and to teach me English. I knew that my country folk were getting $8 and $12 a week in the factories and that I would have done better had I followed them. But I preferred farming so I went with the American farmer to upper New York and there I stayed until I got familiarized with the work and could express myself fluently in English. I am very glad that I did renounce the high wages for I learned a great deal through the kindness of my American boss. He treated me as one of the family. I was terribly lonesome at first. There was not a single Roumanian in the neighborhood

[1] These figures, given by several other Roumanians reporting verbally about occupations and wages in the early period of Roumanian Immigration, i. e. 1900-1910, are very close to the official data gathered by the United States Bureau of Labor. Data available for 1901 and 1902 only show that the average wage for farm labor, with board, varied from $10.17 to $18.68 per month for the former year and from $12.34 to $19.00 per month for the latter. These figures refer specifically to the State of Indiana. (See *Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor*, No. 55, Nov., 1904, p. 1640.) The average daily wage computed from 726 manufacturing establishments for the year 1901, 1902, 1903 and 1904 was respectively $1.53, $1.63, $1.66, and $1.60. (See *Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor*, No. 65, July, 1906, p. 318.)

and New York was ten hours away; but I stood the isolation from my country-folk until two years later when I was able to bring my family from the old country and to start farming on my own account.

These two contrasting illustrations repeated by the experiences of many others suggest that the industrial labor market offered to the newly arriving immigrant better opportunities for employment than farming. American industry was so flourishing and was growing so rapidly that it could absorb all the labor supply coming from Europe. It was so well organized as to have at the ports of entry agents who could speak the language of the immigrants, get in touch with them and offer them immediate occupation, together with their transportation to the place of employment. The high wages offered were in themselves a great attraction, especially to the Roumanian immigrant who was coming to the United States to make money and to return to his native land. Moreover, wages in industry were paid weekly, or semi-monthly, which was a great security and a source of satisfaction to the Roumanian immigrant, thus allowing him to gauge his own earning capacity in the concrete terms of dollars and cents. This also gave him a feeling of independence, for if he were dissatisfied with his work he might easily change it when the pay day was over. Most of all, industry provided opportunity for hiring a great number of workers at once without breaking the groups of the newly arrived immigrants who always tended to keep together because they did not know the English language and they felt more secure in keeping with their kinsmen.

All these advantages presented by American industry and contrasted with the opportunities offered by agricultural pursuits made the latter less attractive to the majority of the Roumanian immigrants. Farming was losing in its competition with American industry in getting labor coming from

Europe. The American farmer was not organized and so was not able to have his agents at ports of entry to induce the arriving immigrants to take up farming. He had to depend on labor exchanges that waited for the immigrants to go to them instead of arranging to meet the boats and get in touch with the new workers before the industrial agents could reach them. The wages for farm laborers were lower than those in industry, varying from $120 to $200 a year with maintenance, while the weekly wages in industry were between $8 and $12. As in Europe farm wages presented also the disadvantage of being paid annually or seasonally, never weekly or semi-monthly. As a farm laborer the Roumanian immigrant had to wait for a long time before he could get his pay and send part of it home. Moreover the demand for help on each individual farm was so small, on account of the development of agricultural machinery that it necessitated the breaking-up of the arriving immigrant groups. The average American farmer did not need more than from two to five farm laborers. As to renting or buying a farm, this was out of the question, for the Roumanians had not the money needed for such an undertaking. The per-capita amount of money for those entering the United States between 1899 and 1910 did not exceed $16.82.[1] It is natural, therefore, that with such inadequate means at their disposal, their inability to speak the English language and their inexperience in the American methods of farming, the Roumanians could not have taken up farming on their own account. In view of the low wages given to farm laborers and of the relative isolation of farm life, few engaged in agricultural work. The majority preferred the high wages of industry which allowed them to realize considerable savings at the end of each year. They flocked to the cities, neither discouraged by the hardships that they imposed upon

[1] *Report of Immigration Commission*, 1911, vol. iii, p. 350.

themselves through this double adaptation to a new environment and a new occupation, nor by the hazards of industry.

Being largely unskilled workers they were ready to take up any kind of work, providing it was lucrative. It was not, therefore, their traditional occupation but opportunities for work which guided the distribution of the Roumanians throughout the United States. They responded to any demand from the Atlantic to the Pacific Coasts so that every state in the Union has some Roumanians. They have concentrated, however, in the middle Atlantic division, which has 54.5%[1] of the entire immigrant population from Roumania; the East North-Central Division with 28.5% and the west north-central with 7.0%. Twelve states alone have 91.4% of these immigrants: New York State leading the list with 39.0%, followed by Ohio with 12.7%, Pennsylvania with 10.9%, Michigan with 6.2%, Illinois with 6.1%, New Jersey with 4.4%, Indiana with 2.7%, California with 2.3%, Minnesota with 2.3%, North Dakota with 1.8%, Montana with 1.6%, Massachusetts with 1.4%; the remainder, 8.6%, being unequally distributed among the other thirty-six states. Three of these states, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania, have 53.6% of the total immigrant population from Roumania. The majority of the Roumanians have settled in the great industrial centers. Only 7% are in urban districts of 2,500 inhabitants or over; 18.3% are in cities of 25,000 inhabitants or over, and 74.7% live in twelve cities of 100,000 inhabitants or over. New York City leads with 38,139 immigrants from Roumania, followed by Philadelphia with 5,645, Chicago with 5,137, Detroit with 4,468,

[1] This percentage and those which follow refer to the "Immigration from Roumania", that is, they include both the Roumanian Jews and the Roumanians and other races migrating from Roumania. In the absence of data regarding the special group of Roumanians we are forced to resort to these figures. These percentages have been computed from data taken from the *United States Census*, vol. ii, 1920, pp. 698, 703.

Cleveland with 4,377, Pittsburgh with 1,493, Minneapolis with 1,484, Youngstown with 1,375, Newark with 1,307, St. Louis with 1,200, Los Angeles with 927, and San Francisco with 765.

Too much stress should not be laid on these figures, as they include both the Roumanian Jews and the Roumanians. The classification on the basis of mother tongue which allows us to isolate these two racial groups has been found misleading in regard to the figures concerning New York City. The 1920 census has estimated at 26,948 the number of people who spoke Roumanian at home. As the language is taken for a sure criterion of race, the natural conclusion is that all these immigrants were Roumanians. But upon investigation it is discovered that less than 1,000 Roumanian Christians, including parents and children, were established in the four boroughs of New York City. On the basis of this error the mother-tongue classification was considered as misleading, and consequently it was not used. Neither should these figures be considered as static because any change in industry which would affect the employment of workers would also affect the size of any immigrant group living within a given city. A case in point is Detroit, which according to the United States census of 1920 had 4,668 immigrants from Roumania.[1] However, the estimates of the Chamber of Commerce and of the Americanization Bureau brought the Roumanian population in 1926 to approximately 30,000.[2] The cause of this rapid growth is not due to immigration, nor to excess of births over deaths, but to a regional migration of the Roumanians who were attracted from other localities to Detroit by the opportunities of employment in the automobile industry. Another illustration is Cleveland, whose

[1] See *United States Census*, 1920, vol. ii, p. 730.

[2] Rough estimate furnished by population charts by the Chamber of Commerce of Detroit.

Roumanian population was given as 4,377 [1] by the census figures of 1920, including both the Roumanians and the Roumanian Jews, though the leaders of the Jewish community have estimated, that the Roumanian Jews alone numbered 4,000 in 1927, while the Roumanian leaders claimed that their colony consisted of 5,000 people, in 1927, and that it had 10,000 people in 1920, prior to the flocking of the Roumanians into the automobile industry in Detroit. However, this decrease in numbers does not affect the prestige of the Cleveland Roumanian colony, which is still considered the intellectual and social center of the Roumanians in the United States. Still another illustration of variations in population among immigrants as result of changes occuring in industry is Akron, Ohio, whose Roumanian colony has considerably decreased in numbers since the decline of the rubber industry. It was estimated by the Roumanian leaders of that city to be 5,000 in 1923, but according to their present day estimates it scarcely reaches 2,000 people, both children and adults. The development of the automobile industry has attracted a great number of the Roumanians not only to Detroit but also to Flint.

A statistical measurement of the distribution of the Roumanians according to occupations is impossible because data are not available. The only detailed information at hand is that concerning agriculture. Out of 9,367 Roumanians who live in rural districts and form 9.0% of the total Roumanian population in the United States, only 693 [2] are farm operators, of whom 533 are owners, 7 managers and 153 tenants. The largest number of these are farm laborers and are scattered in Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Wyoming, Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin.

[1] See *United States Census*, 1920, vol. ii, p. 730.

[2] See Monograph VI, *Farm Population in the United States*, 1920, p. 105.

But the majority of the Roumanian immigrants, or 91.0%, have engaged in industrial occupations. Unlike the Greeks who " furnish an example of the practical absorption of an occupation by an immigrant race," [1] the Roumanians are engaged in a variety of occupations. Already in 1907 the investigation of the Immigration Commission disclosed that the 1916 foreign-born Roumanians reporting data were found in 18 different branches of manufacturing and mining industries.[2] At present, aside from this official data, direct contact with the different Roumanian colonies and the information given by Mr. Drutzu show that they are still engaged in a great variety of industries.[3] They are to be found in all branches of industrial activities and occupations from the cotton mills in the New England towns to the steel and iron industries of Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana; from the mining districts of West Virginia, Pennsylvania and Colorado to the agricultural regions in Minnesota and North Dakota; from optical work in New Jersey to truck farming in California.

The main industries in which the Roumanians are engaged are iron and steel, coal mining, automobile, rubber and meat packing. The greatest number of Roumanians are to be found in the iron and steel industry, especially in the states of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Indiana. In the state of

[1] MacLean, M., *Modern Immigration*, Philadelphia, 1925, p. 42.

[2] Agricultural implements and vehicles, 17; boots and shoes, 43; cigars and tobacco, 3; clothing, 42; coal mining (bituminous), 157; construction work, 74; copper mining and smelting, 23; cotton goods, 10; furniture, 1; glass, 96; gloves, 2; iron and steel, 974; iron and mining, 1; leather, 45; silk goods, 1; slaughtering and meat packing, 420; sugar refining, 1; woolen and worsted goods, 6; a total of 1916 foreign-born male Roumanians. (See *Abstracts of Reports of Immigration Commission*, vol. i, 1911, p. 325.)

[3] The 173 gainfully employed Roumanians over 18 years of age, both men and women, taken from the 100 families of Chicago showed a variety of 34 occupations.

Pennsylvania they are engaged in Philadelphia, by the Baldwin Locomotive Works; in Homestead, by the Carnegie Steel Corporation, the United States Steel Company and the Mesta Machine Works; in McKeesport, by the National Tube Company; in Bethlehem, by the Bethlehem Steel Company; in Sharon, by the Carnegie Steel Company, the Sharon Steel Hoop Company, the National Malleable Steel Casting Company; in Pittsburgh, by the Carnegie Steel Company, the United States Steel Corporation, the Jones-Laughlin Steel Company, and the American Wire and Steel Company.[1]

They are more scattered in the state of Ohio, where they are engaged in Alliance by the Morgan Engineering Company and Reeves Brothers; in Canton by the United Alloy Steel Company and the Timken Roller Bearing Company; in Cleveland by the American Shipbuilding Company, the Hill Clutch Company, the McKinney Steel Company, the Fisher Body Company and the Ruberg Body Company; in Lima by the Ohio Steel Casting Company; in Lorraine by the National Tube Company; in Massillon by the Central Steel and Sheet Company; in Martin's Ferry by the American Sheet and Tin Plate Company, and the Wheeling Sheet and Iron Company; in Philadelphia by the American Sheet and Tin Plate Company; in Warren by the Trumbull Steel Company and the Warren Iron and Steel Company; finally, in Youngstown, by the Youngstown Sheet and Steel Company, the Carnegie Steel Company, and the Republic Iron and Steel Company.

In the state of Illinois the Roumanian iron and steel workers are to be found in Aurora engaged by the Scraper Works; in Chicago by the Burlington & Quincy Railway; in South Chicago by the Illinois Steel Company; in West Pull-

[1] See Drutzu, S., *Romanii in America*, pp. 145-148.

man by the Chicago Malleable Steel Casting Company and the Great Lake Forge Company.

In the State of Indiana they are engaged in East Chicago by the Standard Oil Company; in Gary by the American Bridge Company, the United States Steel Corporation, the Illinois Steel Company, American Steel and Tin Plate Company; and in Indiana Harbor by the Inland Steel Company and the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company.

The coal and mining industry has also a considerable number of Roumanian workers who are largely engaged by the Union Collieries in Parnassus, Pa.; the Pittsburgh Smokeless Coal Company in Jerome, Pa.; and the Finland Greek Coal Company in Whitman, West Virginia.

With the great expansion of the automobile industry it seems that between 10,000 and 12,000 Roumanians are engaged by the different manufacturers in Michigan — the Dodge Brothers Motor Company in Detroit, the Buick Motor Company and Chevrolet Motor Company in Flint, Michigan, and the Ford Motor Company in Highland Park, Fordson and Dearborn (Detroit).

The rubber industry, concentrated in Akron, gives employment to over 500 Roumanians, who are engaged by the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company, the Goodrich Rubber Company, the Goodyear Rubber Company and the Miller Rubber Company.

The slaughtering and meat-packing industry in Chicago, Illinois, St. Louis, Missouri, Cincinnati, Ohio, Kansas City, Kansas, and South Omaha, Nebraska, employs over 1,200 Roumanians.[1]

[1] The Roumanians have been engaged in this industry and in the same cities in 1910, as is disclosed by the investigation carried on under the Board of University of Chicago Settlement. (See Kennedy, J. C. and others, *Wages and Family Budgets in the Chicago Stockyards District*, Chicago, 1914, pp. 32, 33.)

Aside from these main industries the Roumanians are scattered in smaller numbers in others, such as the Glass Industry in McKeesport, Pa.; the General Electric Company in Cleveland, Erie and Schenectady; the cement industry in Universal, Pa.; the canning industry in Camden, N. J.; and the textile industries in Bridgeport, Conn., Woonsocket, R. I., Worcester and Southbridge, Mass., and Grosvenor Dale, Connecticut.[1]

In all these industries the Roumanians are engaged in the heaviest jobs,[2] as is the custom with the newly arrived immigrants, who are always at the bottom of the occupational scale, carrying on the roughest work, which is disliked by the older workers. They are stokers, moulders, smelters, iron casters, miners, etc. But in the course of years, the experience accumulated through their labor and by the acquisition of the English language, has gained for some of them promotion to more desirable occupations and to supervisory responsibilities. A few Roumanians are foremen, for example, at the Ford factory in Detroit, the Miller Rubber Company in Akron, the International Harvester Company in Cleveland, the American Wire Company in Trenton, etc. Many are contractors in the building trades. A less strenuous occupation is that of the Roumanians settled in California and especially in Los Angeles, where "much work is to be found in the truck gardens, in the fields, in gathering fruit, in the fruit-packing factories and in the stations of freight transportation." [3]

[1] See Drutzu, S., *op. cit.*, pp. 145-153.

[2] Referring to the Slavs, among whom the Roumanians are erroneously included, the findings of the investigation give the following statement: "their labor is the heaviest and roughest in the mill—handling steel billets and bars, loading trains, working in cinder pits; labor that demands mostly strength but demands that in large measure." (See *Pittsburgh Survey*, "Labor Conditions in Homestead," 1910, p. 134.)

[3] *America*, No. 227, 29/IX, 1927.

An occupation favored by the Macedonian men is that of waiters in big hotels and restaurants. Their linguistic ability enables them to converse in many languages and makes them valuable in this branch of work in large cities like New York and Boston.

Along with the unskilled workers, there are a few skilled artisans, such as tailors, bakers, carpenters, weavers, watchmakers, barbers, etc., who are to be found in small numbers in every Roumanian colony. They often carry on a business of their own, patronized mainly by their countrymen.

Those who have succeeded in getting better acquainted with their environment and have secured some funds have started grocery stores, music stores, beauty parlors, restaurants, hotels, etc.

Some have become steamship agents,[1] since the Armistice stimulated interest in returning home and it was necessary to help the Roumanians from the inland states to get in touch with the ports of embarkation and the steamship companies. Men who can speak Roumanian and English and can carry on the transactions efficiently fill such positions. Generally the steamship agents combine real estate and money exchange to take care of all the business of the returning passengers and of remittances to relatives in the homeland.

There are only a few Roumanian bankers, one in Chicago, one in Philadelphia, one in New York, one in Canton, Ohio, one in Cleveland, and one in Detroit. Apparently only a few had the ability to start and to maintain such institutions. Moreover many Roumanians patronize the American banks which have Roumanian interpreters in their foreign divisions.

As to the professional men, their number is so small that

[1] In every significant Roumanian colony, such as Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia, Youngstown, Akron, New York, Indianapolis, Pittsburgh, Indiana Harbor, etc., there is at least one Roumanian steamship agency and three or four men engaged in real estate.

they can easily be counted, especially if the Roumanian Jewish professional men, who outnumber the Roumanian Gentiles, are not taken into consideration.

In every big Roumanian colony there are one or two Roumanian doctors, according to the size of the colony. There is a Macedonian physician in Boston, one in Providence, R. I., and a Roumanian one in New York. There are two in Detroit, one of whom is at the head of the X-Ray department of one of the greatest hospitals of the city.

There is a dentist in Chicago, a very good physician in Cleveland, one in Indianapolis, and one in Indiana Harbor, Indiana.

All of these doctors have had their training in Europe, either in Roumania, Austria-Hungary as formerly constituted or Germany, and they are patronized equally by the Americans and the Roumanians.

More numerous are the lawyers, many of whom are recruited from among the younger people who have studied in the United States.

Since America has become the best market for artistic talents, a certain number of Roumanian artists have come to the United States either temporarily or permanently. Orchestra directors, violinists, opera singers, painters, sculptors and university professors are making their homes in the United States, thus bringing to the Roumanian colonies not only the gift of their talent and art, but also their personalities, which command the respect of the American community and add prestige to the Roumanians.

WOMEN

The Roumanian women have invaded many branches of industry. In 1907, of the 146 foreign-born Roumanian women reporting, 61 were employed in the cigar and tobacco industries, 46 in clothing, 31 in slaughtering and meat-

packing, 4 in silk goods, 3 in leather, and 1 in woolen and worsted.[1] At present the majority of them are working in the clothing trades in Chicago, Philadelphia and New York. Some are engaged in cigar-making or in curtain factories, as in Philadelphia; others in laundry work and pressing and cleaning establishments, as in Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit and Philadelphia; and still others in the manufacture of lace, woolen goods and broadcloth, as in Philadelphia, Trenton, and Woonsocket. Many Roumanian-Macedonian women are spinners or dyers in the cotton mills of the New England towns.

Practically none have sought domestic service, not because they were handicapped at first by ignorance of the language, but chiefly because they are called upon to provide homes for their husbands and families.

They prefer factory work whenever possible because it enables them to enjoy a greater independence and to preserve their home ties. Although some are cooks, employed in restaurants and in families, they also live in their own homes. Some of them receive one or two male boarders into their homes as an additional source of income. Still others conduct boarding houses for single men, but this remunerative occupation is passing with the general tendency of the men either to settle down in their own homes or to return to Roumania.

A few of the younger women and girls are engaged as clerks or secretaries in banks, offices and department stores.

A favorite occupation is that of manicurist or hair-dresser, beauty parlors seeming to the women far superior to the factories from the standpoint of social prestige.

Some, more conservative in their outlook, follow the foot-

[1] See *Abstracts of Reports of Immigration Commission*, vol. i, 1911, p. 328.

steps of their mothers and keep to the old jobs, laundering, pressing, cigar-making and weaving.

A very few are in the Ford plants, as the policy of the Ford company is to accept only such women and girls as belong to the families of their men employees.

The tendency among the generation of Roumanians brought up in the United States is to seek for better opportunities in every branch of activity, especially in the industrial field.

Industry still attracts the majority of them, but the educational facilities provided abundantly in every city through night classes and clubs enable a great number of them to engage in easier and more responsible occupations.

More and more emphasis is put on technical training and education, and the first generation of immigrants encourage the children to avail themselves of the opportunities offered by their environment.

Besides the boys and girls who are going to technical schools, there is a considerable number of college students who have risen from the ranks of the working people and are pursuing liberal professions.

The trend followed by the younger generation in passing from unskilled into skilled occupations is very likely to change, in the near future, the occupational distribution of the Roumanians, and furnishes one of the most striking and tangible illustrations of the assimilative process at work.

CHAPTER V

Living Conditions and Standards in the New Country

Despite the variety of home conditions from which the Roumanians, Transylvanians and Roumanian-Macedonians came, they have adopted in the United States a mode of living which speaks well for the influence of the environment, their economic efficiency and their ability to appropriate and utilize the material civilization of America.

But generalities are likely to remain colorless and impersonal unless they are ascribed to a given area. The Chicago colony has been studied as an illustration of the standards of living prevailing among the average Roumanian families. As the living conditions of any given group are not only influenced by but directly related to the economic resources of its members, before entering into the details of housing, crowded conditions, standards of cleanliness, luxuries enjoyed, etc., generally included in the standards of living, it is necessary to deal with the earning capacity of these Roumanian immigrants. The example of the high standards of living of the American worker would have been unavailing if the purchasing power of the Roumanian worker had not allowed him to provide himself with the daily necessities and comforts of life. The wages of the Roumanians as verbally reported in the summer of 1927 vary according to their occupations, the average weekly wage being $44.80, or $7.46 a day.[1] This is quite an exceptional average compared with the average for the general wages in the United States, which in 1925 were " $3.00 to $5.00 a day for the unskilled laborer

[1] This average has been obtained from data given directly to the investigator and dotted on schedules. It is considerably above the

and $5.00 to $10.00 for the skilled worker." [1] This wage of the Roumanians would have secured comfortable living for their families even if the children were numerous, but the average Roumanian family does not exceed two children. This is mostly due to the fact that the Chicago Roumanians, chiefly from the district of Banat—unlike those from Ardeal and Bukovina who have large families with three to six children—seldom have more than two children, because they resort to birth-control methods, a common practice among the Banatians in the old country.

But the men's earnings are not the sole source of the family income. The women and children over eighteen years of age add considerably to the total. However, only in a few cases are the women obliged to work, either because of the temporary incapacity of the husband or of his small wages. Most women freely choose an occupation for the following reasons: to earn more money either for increasing their savings accounts or for making some provision for their old age; to break the monotony or the loneliness of housekeeping and to return to the group life of the factory to which they were accustomed in the early years of their establishment in the United States; and to occupy their leisure time because they can do their housework so quickly with the help of mechanical devices.

The wages of the women also vary according to their occupations, the average weekly wage being $25.85; and as more than half of the women work outside their homes (56 out of 100), their earnings greatly increase the family income.[2]

weekly average $10.90 reported by the Immigration Commission in 1911 for the 1,026 male Roumanian employees, 18 years of age or over, engaged in the manufacturing and mining industries. (See *Abstract of Reports of Immigration Commission*, 1911, vol. i, p. 367.)

[1] Siegfried, A., *America Comes of Age*, p. 154.

[2] A comparison with the weekly wages of 43 Roumanian women, report-

As to the contribution of the boys and girls in this group, it is comparatively small because there are only seventeen boys and girls over eighteen years of age engaged in industry. Their average weekly wage is $26.50, which speaks well for the earning capacity of the younger generation born or brought up in the United States.

The combined resources secure to the family a large income, which fully accounts for the high standards of living of the Roumanians so far remote from the simplicity of their peasant life at home.[1]

Their homes differ greatly from the thatched-roofed peasant cottages of Roumania and Transylvania or the stone houses of the Roumanian-Macedonians, known for their limited facilities and their lack of all modern conveniences. The American homes are less attractive than the peasant cottages. They have no wooden fences or doors carved by hand, no bright decorations of birds or animals, no friezes in Byzantine designs. They lack the flame-colored hangings on their walls, the home-spun carpets or the down pillows piled to the ceiling. Except for a few family pictures, which display the paraphernalia of the national Roumanian costume, or for a few distinctive hand-made embroideries and perhaps for a Roumanian flag, there is nothing in the home in America which reminds one of the peasant cottage. The

ing complete data to the Immigration Commission in 1908, and employed in the manufacturing industries, shows that 20 years ago the average weekly wage of the women did not exceed $7.57. (See *Abstracts of Reports of Immigration Commission*, 1911, vol. i, p. 368.)

[1] Mr. P., formerly from Comnosh and at present in Chicago, is a barber earning $40 a week. His wife is employed as a button-hole maker at $24 a week and their only son, a mechanic in the automobile industry, earns $30 a week. The total income of the family thus reaches $94 a week, while the expenses amount to $50, including $15 for rent, $15 for food, $9 for recreation and $11 for clothing and miscellaneous expenses. They live in a comfortable apartment with all the modern conveniences, electricity, central heat, bath room, etc. and they even have a Chrysler car.

new home follows the uniformity of the home of the average industrial worker and can easily be taken for the home of a Polish, a Greek or a Serbian immigrant. But it has modern comforts which in Europe are enjoyed only by the few, because they are considered luxuries even by the middle class, whose income is much smaller than that of the average American industrial worker.

There are three types of houses in which the Roumanains live and which vary according to the neighborhoods, to the earning capacity of the family and to its conception of comfortable living. There are the regular two to four family houses for the average worker, of the type predominating fifteen to twenty years ago. The apartments are fairly comfortable with three to five rooms, water supply and a gas range, sometimes even with electric light, but they lack all the other modern comforts. Their surroundings are not attractive because they are in the vicinity of factories which gives them a dingy appearance. They are occupied by the more conservative of the Roumanians, who are not seeking comfort and attractive surroundings but are dominated by the idea of money-making and saving for their children or for their old age. These homes are to be found in the three sections of the city where the Roumanians have formed more compact neighborhoods, the greenhouse, the Fullerton-Clyborn, and the stockyard districts.[1]

Besides these old types of homes there are the up-to-date apartments and bungalows equipped with all modern conveniences, such as bath-room, electric light and central heat. They are scattered among the newer residential sections of the city which are inhabited by the more progressive native American working classes. These sections are developing far from the factories in the north, northwest and western parts of Chicago and have pleasant surroundings such as

[1] See Appendix, chapter xii.

parks, gardens, etc. They are occupied by the more progressive Roumanians, either of the younger generation or of the older who have achieved economic independence and are able to have pleasanter and more comfortable homes. Despite the distances which separate the Roumanians living in these residential sections from those living in the crowded neighborhoods, they do not break away from their compatriots. They are in close contact with them, fully participating in the social life of the Roumanian colony.

Finally, there is the boarding house to be found in each of the three Roumanian neighborhoods, but which has greatly departed from its original type, the institution of twenty years ago in which twenty to thirty persons lived within three rooms, often sleeping on the floor rolled in their blankets.[1] Each of the three boarding houses visited showed that the general conditions have greatly improved.[2] Every boarder has his personal bed and there are seldom three men to a room. Some provision is made for the personal belongings of each boarder so that he may enjoy some privacy. There is a common bath-room, but as all floor space is utilized, the kitchen or the hall is used successively as a dining room, smoking room and living room.

[1] In 1908, the investigation of the Immigration Commission disclosed that 77.9% of the Roumanian households whose members were engaged in manufacturing and mining industries, kept boarders and lodgers. The average number of the latter, based on the total number of households keeping boarders and lodgers was 1203. (See *Abstract of Reports of Immigration Commission*, 1911, vol. i, p. 425.)

[2] Commenting upon the crowded conditions in boarding houses, the *Pittsburgh Survey* stated: "It is in the immigrant lodging houses that conditions are the worst, though not always so with the choice of the men. The Croatians, Servians, Roumanians and Greeks have only from 5 to 10% of women among them; hence the men of these nationalities have but few boarding houses conducted by their own people to go to, and crowding is inevitable." (See *Wage Earning Pittsburgh*, 1914, p. 46.)

The most interesting feature of the boarding house is its scheme of cooperative buying and consumption. Each boarder who comes to live in such a house provides his own bed and pays the landlady $8.50 a month for taking care of the rooms and preparing the food. All bills for rent, electricity, gas, laundry, food supplies are shared among the boarders, either weekly or monthly, except for the landlady, who gets her meals free of charge. Often outsiders, such as single men living alone, take their meals in these boarding houses on the same basis as the regular boarders.

On the whole, except for the dwellings occupied by groups of single men, the homes of the Roumanians in the working districts are spacious and airy and, in the residential districts of the native American working classes, quite comfortable. However, a more accurate way of evaluating the type of dwellings occupied by the Roumanians is obtained by examining the amount of money paid for rent. This amount varies from $5 a month for a single room to $80[1] for an up-to-date comfortable apartment. The average rent for the 100 households is $24.20 per month.[2] Sixty-seven families live in rented dwellings; the remainder, 33, have homes of their own, the value of which varies from $3500 to $12,000.

As to the old living conditions of the Roumanians, they have greatly improved since 1910. The investigation of the Immigration Commission showed at that time that there were 2.57 Roumanians living in one room and 12.47 persons per household.[3] At present the average number of persons per household in the Chicago Roumanian colony is 4.3; that of rooms per household, 4.9. That gives us less than one

[1] Figures given orally to the investigator during her visits to the Roumanian families.

[2] Rents have increased since the War; they are almost double the $12.86 which was paid by the 71 Roumanian households in 1908. (See *Abstract of Reports of Immigration Commission*, 1911, vol. i, p. 420.)

[3] *Abstract of Reports of Immigration Commission*, 1911, vol. i, p. 431.

person per room, which shows that there is probably no overcrowding among the Chicago Roumanians.

This change is attributed to the following causes: First, the change of the Roumanian immigration from a temporary to a permanent one, which has gradually relieved the crowded conditions of the temporary settlements and has enlarged the living quarters of each family, giving breathing space to every one of its members; secondly, the betterment of the economic conditions of the Roumanians, due to the rise in wages in the war period, which made possible higher rents; thirdly, the keen appreciation of fresh air and of better home surroundings as a means of keeping fit for longer hours and more remunerative work. The standards of cleanliness are not less satisfactory than the general housing situation.

But while home surroundings and general conditoins fluctuate according to the financial resources of the family, cleanliness is relatively independent of economic considerations. For this reason the Roumanian homes, taken from the working districts or the residential sections of the city, present no such dark picture of filth and vermin as those found in the tenement homes of New York City at the beginning of the twentieth century.[1] Only one of the hundred Chicago homes visited presented an unusual state of disorder and dirt. The woman was bedridden, suffering from a chronic disease, and the husband, an habitual drunkard, never cared for his wife. Seventy-nine of the homes have first-rank standards,[2] though thirty-six of the women are engaged in work outside their homes and have little time left for housekeeping. Twelve of the remaining homes have medium standards and nine are below par.

[1] Knopf, S. A., "What Shall we do with the Consumptive Poor," *Proceedings of National Conference of Charities and Corrections*, Boston, 1902.

[2] The homes were rated according to three categories: A—meaning excellent order and healthful surroundings. B—meaning fairly good order. C—meaning untidiness, refuse on the floor, etc.

Judged from their outward appearance as expressed by types of homes and standards of cleanliness, the living condition of the Roumanians present a favorable picture. The setting, however, only partly portrays their modes of living. There is a difference between securing necessities and enjoying the comforts of life, between having a minimum equipment for one's daily needs and having at hand all available devices making possible the realization of high standards of living. Despite their relatively high wages and the surplus thus provided, not all the Roumanians indulge in the usual comforts of American life and only a few have such luxuries as telephones, radios, victrolas, cars, etc. There are some who earn very high wages, $80 to $100 a week, and are content with a meager life; others who earn less, $50 to $60, seek a comfortable life even in a rented home. At equal family incomes the comforts enjoyed vary because they are a question of personal choice, habit and appreciation. However, ownership has an important influence on the choice of the home and the comforts it provides. Nearly all the 33 privately owned homes [1] are of the bungalow or the more attractive three-family apartment house type. Except for five, all have electric lights and bath rooms; 22 have steam heat and 21 telephones. Many of the rented homes provide comfortable living quarters but they lack the facilities of modern buildings in the residential sections. Only eight of them have steam heat, 11 have bath rooms, and 48 have electric light. This shows that the home owners enjoy more comfort than those who rent their homes. As to the luxuries, such as victrolas, radios, pianolas, etc., they were

[1] Home ownership for the 77 Roumanian families investigated in 1908 did not exceed 2.6%. Within the 20 years period, 1908-1928, this percentage has reached 33.0%, which illustrates that the Roumanians have greatly improved their economic status and have considerably advanced in the process of economic assimilation. (See *Abstract of Reports of Immigration Commission*, 1911, vol. i, p. 468.)

equally enjoyed among the two sets of people. The Roumanians have not yet reached the American average of one car for every 5.6 people.[1] Twenty-five families, or one-quarter of the 100 visited, own a car.

While comforts and luxuries differ from family to family, there seems to be a greater uniformity in the food habits and recreation. The meals of the Roumanians are substantial, well prepared, rich in calories to rebuild the energy lost in the day's labor.

Their recreation takes the form of Sunday social activities organized by their beneficial and cultural societies or their clubs, of evenings at the movies, or typically American automobile rides.

The present standards of living of the Roumanians show that they have undergone considerable adjustment to the American environment since the time they left their native villages. The Roumanian peasant in his native country had not enjoyed any comforts in life. All his hard work aimed at buying a house for his old age, but in the United States the socialized Roumanian peasant has developed new habits, because from a day laborer he has gradually become a small capitalist. Besides having a home, he plans to protect himself against the risks of industrial life and to enjoy the luxuries of life, such as a car, musical instruments, etc. Not all of the Roumanians are insurance-policy holders but many of them are members of their beneficial and cultural societies and a considerable number have savings in the banks. It has been impossible to evaluate the total amount of their savings, but their living conditions show that they have a surplus in wages which allows them to lead a comfortable life and to make some provision for their old age. On the whole, the security brought about by high wages has changed the old habits of parsimonious savings and has

[1] Siefried's *America Comes of Age*, p. 161.

given the possibility of freely expressing their natural joyfulness and of better enjoyment of leisure time.

The most outstanding fact about the living conditions of the Roumanians is their rise parallel with economic development. Starting with low standards which corresponded to low wages, their living conditions have gradually improved when the earning capacity increased. Due to their acquisition of skill, to their knowledge of English and to their better acquaintance with conditions in the United States, this slow amelioration of their economic condition has given rise to a migratory movement within the city limits. Located at first in the outskirts of the city where rent and living standards were low, they have gradually moved to districts near the places of their employment where better housing conditions are to be found. But with a still further increase of their economic power they tend to depart from the factory neighborhoods and to go into the pleasanter and more comfortable residential quarters of the working people. Thus, thanks to their economic betterment, the Roumanians have gradually succeeded in adopting the material civilization of America, which is the first step to their conformity to the standards prevailing among Americans.

It goes without saying that the living conditions of the Roumanians in Chicago are not exactly duplicated in the other cities where the Roumanians live. But despite the environmental difference between the apartment house of the Bronx and the bungalows of Chicago, the company house in Columbus, N. J., and the dingy wooden house of Youngstown, the comfortable cottages of Highland Park and the old-fashioned homes of West Philadelphia, there is a similarity in the modes of living of the Roumanians which allows us to consider the Roumanian colony of Chicago as fairly representing the average standards to be found among the Roumanians in the United States and the forward steps taken by them in the process of their economic assimilation.

CHAPTER VI

The Persistence of Ethnic Contacts in the New Life

The Beneficial and Cultural Societies. The Church: Greek Orthodox, Greek Catholic, Roumanian Baptist. The parochial schools. The socialist clubs. The press.

In the slow process which brought about among the Roumanians, Transylvanians and Roumanian-Macedonians the restoration of their ethnic group contacts, two distinct sets of factors are of fundamental importance. The first one is designated as original culture, meaning by that the modes of thought and action, of belief and customs prevailing in the old country, those which the Roumanian immigrants brought with them to the United States. Thanks to their psychological nature these factors helped to restore the solidarity and group consciousness of the early immigrants and to reestablish the types of institutions based on the original culture, such as the church, the parochial school and the press. The second factor comprises all the new interests that the immigrants developed from their contact with their new environment. In contrast to the old culture, these new influences are referred to as the "new culture". Born out of circumstances and of needs, promoted by the powerful influence of imitation or simply aroused by way of propaganda, these interests strengthened the cohesion of the group and motivated new group contacts which crystallized into associations such as the cultural and beneficial societies, the workers' socialistic organizations, the political clubs and the sport clubs. Neither of these factors has acted independently or in successive periods in bringing about the group cohesion. It is due to their simultaneous activity that the

present-day Roumanian organizations of the United States owe their existence. Undoubtedly the influence of the original culture has been first at work in bringing together those of a common language, of a common faith, of a common tradition, because the immigrants did not throw overboard the luggage of traditions and beliefs when they broke away from their country.

In the early period of immigration the psychological factors of the old culture exercised their strongest influence. The blending of the first-comers into small groups did not, however, take place around the institutions of the old culture, such as the church, the parochial schools and the press. It was chiefly the direct result of the psychological factors of habit and custom, of memory of the old patterns of life and of community of language. As relatives, friends or old acquaintances from the native village and districts joined the first Roumanian immigrants in the United States they were drawn together by ties of kinship, of common traditions, of a spirit of neighborliness, of village or district allegiance. These transplanted allegiances were so strong that whenever immigrants from the same district or region reached the United States they were drawn together in the same cities, or in distinctive neighborhoods within the same city. Even now old home ties have an equal influence with the new cultural interest in determining the cohesion of the Roumanian groups and we find that the district allegiances have determined the character of the Roumanian colonies, most of which are composed of people who have come from the same region.[1] The group life of these early

[1] In the Roumanian colony of Trenton, New Jersey, all of the 200 families have come from the district of Satmar, in Transylvania; in Woonsocket, Rhode Island, the fifty families of Macedonians have come from the village of Frashari; in Chicago, the whole district of Fullerton-Clybourn is made up of Roumanians from the Banat, while the stockyard colony is composed chiefly of Bukovinians.

Roumanian colonists found expression only in the casual gatherings around the saloons or the boarding houses. There the Roumanians exchanged their personal experiences and their news from home; sung their *doinas* (pastoral songs); expressed their longings for a return home; confessed their successes or their failures and their hardships in their adaptation to the new environment. Throughout this early period of group formation, prior to 1902, no institutions came into existence because of the temporary character of the early immigration. The Roumanians did not intend to establish themselves permanently in the United States; they came only with the hope of saving within two or three years enough money to make it possible to return to their native villages and to buy a small property. Their precarious situation as simple wage-earners and the necessity of economy, together with their small number, prevented them from spending their small savings for the building up of institutions. Not a single church did they have, not even a priest. The men had formed the habit of gathering in the saloons outside of factory hours. It was there that on Sundays they began singing hymns and cantiques, until gradually they were able to sing the whole service. As there were few women and children among the early Roumanian immigrants, the inappropriate surroundings of a saloon or a pool-room were not noticed. For such events as a death, a marriage celebration or a christening, the Roumanians, Macedonians and most of the Transylvanians who belonged to the Greek Orthodox Church resorted to the services of Serbian, Greek or Russian priests who were of the same faith. As for the small number of Transylvanians who belonged to the Roman Catholic Church, they went to the churches of the Hungarians because they were familiar with the Hungarian language. Thus a complete absence of institutional life characterizes this early period of group contacts.

BENEFICIAL AND CULTURAL SOCIETIES

But about 1902 the group life of the Roumanians is strengthened by the appearance of institutions which tend to become the rallying point of the Roumanian colonies. The most salient fact is that these institutions are the direct outcome of circumstances or of imperative need. As time went by, hopes for a return home were postponed because the Roumanians did not succeed in greatly improving their economic condition in the two or three years which they had set for their stay in the United States. They realized that their temporary residence had to be prolonged indefinitely. This change of attitude towards their establishment in the United States brought to the fore, in a more vivid and impressive way, the problems which had arisen in their midst and which were calling for an immediate solution. Unaccustomed to handling mechanical implements, many Roumanians met with industrial accidents. With the continued influx of newcomers these accidents multiplied rapidly. Some men were temporarily incapacitated; others maimed for life were forced to return home; others fell victim to fatal accidents. In the majority of cases either the victims or their families were left resourceless. The Roumanian compatriots were forced to provide for temporary help, funeral expenses or the support of a widow and of orphan children. They never shirked their responsibility in such cases. Everyone made his contribution according to his means; but the greatest toll on national solidarity was imposed upon those who had achieved some financial success.

Simple peasant folk like the pioneers Martin and Sufana, endowed with unusual ability, conceived the idea of starting among their compatriots beneficial and cultural societies like those of their neighbors the Czechs, the Slavs or the Hungarians. Willing to sacrifice their spare time for the benefit of their group, they devoted their efforts to building up these

mutual-help institutions. Through their zealous efforts two societies were instituted in 1902, one in Homestead, Pa., called "Vulturul", the other in Cleveland, O., called "Carpatina". These societies were organized chiefly on the plan of a small insurance company, directly controlled by the representatives of the policy-holders. Each member paid a monthly fee which assured him some compensation in case of accident or some indemnity to his family in case of death. The death benefit varied from 100 to 200 dollars. Later it was fixed at 700 dollars, but in any case it was provided by the equal contributions on the part of all the members of the society. But their purpose was cultural as well, though no definite educational program was formulated aside from the maintenance and promotion of their original culture.

The direct cultural influence upon the members of these societies was drawn out of the regular monthly meetings. After the transaction of business the members engaged in long discussions, exchanged accounts of daily experiences and tried better to understand their American environment. The daring individual came to the fore and presented his ideas with conviction, pathos and humor. The shy one kept silent, but for every member present in these meetings this exchange of ideas was profitable. Some learned the discipline of parliamentary procedure, and others became familiar with the diverse conditions of American industries, the methods of different factories, the labor organizations and opportunities for better employment. According to their own statements, some Roumanians perfected their scanty knowledge of reading and writing,[1] through their connections with these organizations. Within four years from the creation of the first

[1] "I knew how to read but I was very poor at writing", confessed Mr. N. from Homestead, Pa., the very efficient and capable president of a society, "but when I was elected secretary, quite against my will, I had to keep minutes and to do all the transactions of the society so that I set myself to perfect my writing and succeeded".

society, fourteen more were founded. This rapid growth encouraged the leaders and promoters of these institutions to consolidate all the Roumanian beneficial and cultural societies.

From an economic point of view this was a very sound policy. The consolidation of the isolated small societies into one strong organization meant that it might attract more members and increase the monetary benefit. From the standpoint of social organization it was a means of rallying all the Roumanians scattered in the United States and of developing among them a spirit of ethnic instead of local solidarity. The scheme was perhaps too ambitious or too premature to succeed at once. Only two societies, "Vulturul", from Homestead, Pa., and "Invierea", from Martin's Ferry, O., signed in 1906 the Consolidation Act of the Union of the Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies. The others, jealous of their independence, refused to surrender their local freedom and refrained from joining the Union, not realizing the double benefit that it was offering. However, the zealous leaders of the Union spared no effort or fatigue to help the non-organized Roumanian colonies build their own beneficial and cultural societies. Some, like I. Papaiov, traveled from colony to colony stirring up the interest of their compatriots, firing their national pride by presenting to them the successful mutual-aid societies of their neighbors the Hungarians, the Poles, etc. Thanks to these efforts the Roumanian societies which entered the Union grew from 26 in 1908 to 44 by 1911. But in 1912 the Union received a terrific blow. A few intellectuals among the Roumanian industrial workers tried to live at the expense of the latter, exploiting their lack of experience. They succeeded in forming independent societies which federated under the name of the League, thus waging war against the Union. Despite many vicissitudes the Union of the Bene-

ficial and Cultural Societies resisted valiantly the attacks of the League and grew steadily. In 1923, in order to comply with the state laws of Ohio regarding the management of insurance companies, the Union was reorganized on a totally different basis and adopted the sliding scale system.[1] The advantages offered by the Union now commanded the respect even of its enemies. Gradually the few independent societies which formed the League realized that their interests would be better served were they to join the Union. The idea of a merger was actively discussed in 1913, but the ensuing years brought no satisfactory results. However, after the reorganization of the Union in 1923 the chances for a merger seemed greater. A series of conventions [2] have led the representatives of both the Union and the League to agree on questions of principle and to set aside the small details which were the cause of misunderstanding. Following a successful campaign which lasted over three years, the merger took place on March 10, 1928, when the state authorities at Columbus, Ohio, incorporated the two societies under the name of the Union and League of Roumanian Societies of America, Inc.[3]

This historical sketch of the development of these beneficial and cultural societies is of interest chiefly because it brings to the attention the number of group organizations rather than because of their total membership, which does not exceed 6,500.[4] The main contribution of these societies

[1] Under the new system the monthly dues vary with the total amount of indemnity claimed and with the age of the member, who is subject to medical examination. The death indemnity varies between 500 and 1,500 dollars, according to the policy held by the individual member.

[2] Conventions of: Canton, Ohio, April 26, 1924, June 14-15, 1924, October 5, 1924 and November 27, 1924. (See *America,* no. 60, March 12, 1928.)

[3] See: *Appendix.* List of Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies.

[4] Figures given by Mr. A. Prie, Grand President of the Union and League of the Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies.

to the life of the Roumanian colonies lies not so much in the service rendered to the small circle of their members but chiefly in the part they played in developing the church, the parochial school and the press, which benefit all the Roumanian immigrants irrespective of whether or not they are members of the Union.

THE GREEK ORTHODOX ROUMANIAN CHURCH

It is a striking fact that the Greek Orthodox churches of the Roumanians, Transylvanians and Roumanian-Macedonians in the United States, instead of being the central point of interest around which the Roumanian colonies were built, owe their existence to the activities and efforts of the members of the Beneficial and Cultural Societies. The latter were organized in 1902, but it was not before 1906 that the first Orthodox priest was called to the United States by the Cleveland colony. Gradually other Roumanian centers,[1] having by this time organized societies of their own, sent petitions to the Greek Orthodox Bishop of Sibiu in Transylvania to recommend priests. Some came in 1908 and, with the help of the leading men in the Beneficial and Cultural Societies, the Parish Committees were organized. The first parish was that of St. Mary's in Cleveland, organized in 1904,[2] though its church was not built before 1908. Indiana Harbor claims the honor of being first to have built a church, having inaugurated St. George's in 1907.[3] At the close of 1926 there were thirty-four Roumanian churches of the Greek Orthodox faith with a membership of 18,853,[4] thirty-two of them being in urban territory with a membership of 18,436.

[1] Indiana Harbor, Indiana, Gary (Indiana), Alliance (Ohio), Martins Ferry (Ohio), Chicago (Illinois), Cincinnati (Ohio), Indianapolis (Indiana) and Youngstown (Ohio).

[2] Calendarul Ziarului, *America*, 1925, p. 107.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1925, p. 110.

[4] See New York *Times*, June 3, 1928, also: *U. S. Bureau of Census,*

The custom is for a single priest with an established church to officiate in and minister to several nearby parishes.[1] The late development of the Roumanian Orthodox churches, lagging behind the fraternal organizations, is due largely to the character of the church itself and only in part to the difficulty in raising money for its buildings and support.

The Greek Orthodox Roumanian Church was not organized for missionary work. It had no funds to send priests to the Roumanians in the United States in order to safeguard their religious and cultural traditions. Its hierarchy did not extend beyond the boundaries assigned to its jurisdiction in Roumania. Left to their own initiative, the Roumanian immigrants did not send for priests and did not consider building churches until after they had organized themselves sufficiently to provide the remuneration for the services of the priest and for the support of the church. The priests who came either on their own accord, or at the recommendation of the Bishop of Sibiu, were not altogether in sympathy with the spirit predominating among the Roumanian immigrants. They brought with them the class prejudices of the Old Country. Feeling quite superior, intellectually, to their

Census of Religious Bodies, 1926, Eastern Orthodox Churches, Washington, D. C., 1929, p. 23. The number of 18,853 refers probably to the communicant members of the church. (See footnote 2, page 94.) Substracting the 1,700 Greek Catholic Roumanians, the 850 Roumanian Baptists and the 200 Socialists, who have no church affiliation whatever, from the total 91,683 Roumanians (parents and their native born children) given by the 1920 Census, the approximate estimate of the Roumanians, belonging by baptism to the Greek Orthodox Church is about 89,000.

[1] For instance the Macedonians in New York City are calling now upon the Transylvanian priest from Bridgeport, Connecticut, to hold monthly services in the Russian Orthodox Church, while in the previous years the few Transylvanians in the City secured the services of the Transylvanian priest in Philadelphia. In the same way the priest of Gary, Indiana, ministers to the Roumanians of Indiana Harbor and of Clearing, Illinois, whenever these parishes are left without a priest.

parishioners, they endeavored to monopolize not only the spiritual but the whole leadership of the colonies.[1] The parishioners, on the other hand, who felt that the priests were at their command because they were paying them a salary, objected to having the clergy mix in the administration of community affairs. As both parties held strongly to their points of view, their relationships grew more and more strained. The priests failed, perhaps, to see that their parishioners in the process of developing leadership were strongly opposed to any intrusion which might have undermined their power. Consequently they were unwilling to make any compromise. Moreover the parishioners, dismayed, maybe, by the example of one of their priests, who deviated from his mission and was more interested in making money than in attending to his ministerial duties, held the clergy in suspicion, despite the fact that many were devoted to the interests of their flocks. The struggle for leadership between the laymen and the clergy lasted many years, neither side making any concession. It was brought to a climax in the war period. Contacts between the colonies and the Bishop of Sibiu were severed on account of the discontinuance of communications. Being unable to secure a better class of clergy from the old country, some of the colonies were forced to accept the Roumanian priests newly ordained by the Russian Bishop in New York City.[2] These priests came

[1] Commenting upon the situation of the priests in the Roumanian community, the daily *America* writes: "Every priest in his own parish is a Pasha; he does whatever he wants, according to his whims. He never takes any advice and he has no one to supervise him." (See *America*, #59, March 10, 1928.

[2] The Russian Bishop was appointed by the Soviet Government to replace the one, who received his authority from the Tzar, the then Head of the Greek Orthodox Church in Russia. The Soviet Government cut off the subsidy of $40,000 that the Russian Empire was granting to the Russian Church in New York City, for its upkeep. The loss of this income had to be made up in other ways. The new Bishop was

from the rank and file of the workers and were seeking in the quieter and more respectable life of the priesthood [1] an escape from the monotony and din of industrial life. Their leadership was lacking in understanding and social prestige. This was openly recognized at the Convention of Laymen and Priests, which met on March 10, 1918,[2] and adopted the significant "*Hrisov*" (Charter), whereby the Roumanians in North America recognized the spiritual leadership of the Archbishop of Bucarest.[3] After the armistice a number of well-trained priests, recommended by the Bishops of Bucarest and Sibiu, came to replace the unsuccessful ones. By 1923 the situation was so improved, the priests regained so much the respect of their parishioners, that they called a convention for the purpose of reorganizing on a solid basis the Greek Orthodox Roumanian churches of America. The convention recommended the creation of a Bishopric for the

therefore glad to have the opportunity of charging fees for the ordaining of priests, after a totally inadequate training. No consideration was given to the previous education of the applicants and any one was accepted who was able to pay the required fee, varying from $300 to $500. (See Drurzu, *Romanii in America,* p. 211.)

[1] They did not have the necessary cultural bakground to become real spiritual leaders. Their inadequate training under the Russian Bishop hardly enabled them to conduct the ritual. The character of some of them was not even above reproach. Having entered the Church as a means of livelihood, rather than in response to a higher call, they were unable to rise above the petty misunderstandings and friction occurring so often between laymen and clergy among immigrant groups. Only the very exceptional individuals are still kept within the Church.

[2] See *America,* no. 60, March 12, 1928.

[3] Since that time a select group of prelates, temporarily detached from their official posts in Roumania, came to America. Eight arrived shortly after the armistice. At first they were received with reservations, because they were suspected of being emissaries of the Liberal Party with which the Transylvanians had no sympathy. But when it was fully recognized that they had no political affiliations, they were accepted with enthusiasm.

supervision of the churches in the United States, but no action was taken.[1]

The Roumanian churches of the Greek Orthodox faith still remain as independent, self-governed and self-appointed units. Their relations to the Old Country church administration are only in the form of friendly exchanges of greetings and wishes.

In view of the tardy development of the Church and of the vicissitudes through which it passed, it is no wonder that it has not been the stronghold around which the Roumanian colonies were built, and that it was given precedence to the Beneficial and Cultural Societies.

THE ROUMANIAN-MACEDONIANS

Strongly attached to their traditions, the Roumanian-Macedonians established their group contacts on the basis of their allegiance to their regional origin. Scarcely arrived, they organized, in 1903, their first society *"Farserotul"*,[2] which purported to unite all the Macedonians from Frashari, scattered in Roumania, Albania and the United States, into a powerful organization for the promotion of their ethnic

[1] The question of the reorganization of the Church came up at each Annual Convention of the Association of Roumanian-American Priests and more forcibly so in February, 1928. (See *America*, no. 46, February 24, 1928). It seems as if before long this reorganization will be *a fait accompli*. On December 6, 1928, Reverend T. Scorobets, from the Holy Synod of Bucarest came to investigate the religious and social situation of the Roumanians, as a basis for the much needed reorganization of the Church. It is hoped that the answers to his questionnaire in the Roumanian press, will help the Church Convention to be held in February, 1929, to find the true solution to the problem of awakening the Roumanian immigrant to his religious duties. (See *America*, no. 285, 290, December 6 and 10, 1928.)

[2] The Society has its headquarters in New York City and has eight Chapters: five in the United States, (in Bridgeport and North Grosvenordale, Connecticut, in Woonsocket, Rhode Island and in St. Louis, Missouri and in New York City); 2 in Albania (Plesa and Coritsa) and one in Bucarest.

culture and for mutual help. Following the example of the Macedonians from Frashari, those from Perivolia, Grevena, Muzacherul, etc. created their own societies.[1] Like the Roumanians of the Greek Orthodox faith, the Macedonians erected their church building [2] long after they established their cultural and beneficial societies.

THE GREEK CATHOLIC ROUMANIANS

However, for the Roumanians of the Greek Catholic faith, the Church has been the rallying point of their group life ever since its formative period, and it has initiated all the other organizations. This is due to the prestige that the Catholic Church has for its members and to the leadership it assumes in any community of its faith.

Better organized for missionary work than the Orthodox Church, the *Uniate* or *Greek Catholic* Church of Transylvania has sent to America prelates trained in the Theological Faculty of Blaj (Transylvania) and in Rome, where they obtained a broader point of view. Of high moral character, unencumbered by family,[3] they commanded the respect of their flock by their zeal in promoting the well-being of their parishioners. They were able to collaborate with their Parish Committees [1] in erecting the churches, in developing the

[1] *Unirea* and *Perivolia*, in New York City, in 1909, *Parintele Averchie*, in Woonsocket, R. I. (reorganized in 1923 under the name of *Roumanian-American Society*), *Muzichiarul* in Southbridge, Massachusetts and the *Roumanian Greek Society*, in Manchester, New Hampshire, organized by the Roumanians from Thessaly. (See *Calendarul America*, 1925, pp. 61-62).

[2] The Church of St. John the Baptist, in Woonsocket, was built in 1912 and only recently the colonies of Southbridge and Bridgeport succeeded in having their own churches.

[3] The Greek Catholic Church has retained the custom of the Greek Orthodox Church in permitting the priests to marry. But out of consideration for the rule of celibacy in the Roman Catholic Church, the Greek Catholic Consistory of Blaj has sent to the United States only priests, who have lost their wives.

parochial schools, the press and the social organizations of mutual help, quite separately from those of the Orthodox Roumanians. This exclusiveness was not compulsory, for it allowed the individual member to join the other Roumanian organizations of another creed. It helped, however, by making Catholicism the basis of membership, to reenforce the solidarity of the Roumanian Catholics. This group allegiance, based on religious belief, was strengthened by the encouragement that the Roumanian Catholics received from their Bishop in Transylvania and from the higher prelates of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States.[2] The Bishop in Cleveland has under his supervision all the Roumanian Catholic churches in his diocese, and in exchange receives their contribution to the support of the Bishopric. With such an enlightened leadership on the part of its prelates and with a keen cooperation on the part of its members,

[1] Within a few years and with only a membership of 1,700 (figures given in February, 1929 by Rev. A. Bungardean, from Trenton, N. J.) they built eighteen churches: St. Helen, in eastern Cleveland, in 1905; St. Mary, in Youngstown, in 1906; St. Michael, in Aurora, Illinois, in 1906-1908; St. Mary in Scalp Level, Pa., in 1907; St. Theodor, in Alliance, Ohio, in 1909; St. Basil, in Trenton, N. J., in 1909; St. Mary, in Roebling, N. J., in 1912. St. George, in Canton, Ohio, in 1912; St. Nicholas, E. Chicago, Illinois, in 1914; St. Demetrius, in Indiana Harbor, in 1914; St. Michael and Gavril, in Dayton, Ohio, in 1915; Holy Trinity, in eastern Cleveland, in 1916; St. John the Baptist, in Detroit, Michigan, in 1917; St. George, in Erie, Pa., in 1919; St. Basil, in Lorain, Ohio; Salvation, in Youngstown, Ohio; St. Elias, in Ellwood City and the Holy Cross, in Martins Ferry. (See Rev. Bungardean, A., "Spicuri si Amintiri," 1919 and *America*, March and November 1927 and January 1928.) They then organized, under the auspices of each Church and with the collaboration and administration of the laymen, eight parochial schools and sixteen Mutual Aid Societies, similar to the fraternal organizations of the Greek Orthodox Roumanians. These societies federated in 1919 under the name of the "Union of the Greek Catholic Roumanians in Northern America." Its president is a layman, responsible for his office to the Annual General Assembly. (See Bungardean, A., *Spicuri si Amintiri*, 1919, p. 188.)

[2] See *America*, no. 219, September 17, 1928.

the Greek Catholic Church continues to be for the Roumanian Catholics the stronghold of their social organization.

ROUMANIAN BAPTISTS

As to the Roumanian Baptists, their group cohesion, like that of the Greek Catholics or the Uniates, was derived from their allegiance to the Church. Arriving about 1908, they built their first church in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1910, under the direction of Reverend C. R. Ingersan. Other churches quickly arose, their number at present being sixteen. This is rather considerable in comparison to the total eight hundred and fifty Roumanian Baptists in the United States, and evidences the strength and the enthusiasm of their faith. Financial help and moral support on the part of the American Baptist Home Mission Society have contributed also to the flourishing condition of these churches. Money was advanced or a small subsidy was given for the erection of the church buildings, while leadership was trained in the International Baptist Seminary in East Orange, New Jersey.[1] In 1913 the Roumanian Baptist Association of North America was founded, with the purpose of coordinating the activities and of strengthening the solidarity of the group.

A religious newspaper, the "Luminatorul" (the Illuminator) serves as a *trait d'union* to the Roumanian Baptists throughout the United States, linking them together in a brotherhood. As a consequence of their strong religious beliefs, the Roumanian Baptists keep apart from their other compatriots, with whom they have little to do, except at festivals of a patriotic character. They abide strictly by the moral code of their church and abstain from alcoholic beverages. Eager for self-improvement, they prefer Bible circles and religious discussions, rather than noisy entertain-

[1] Already four Roumanian Baptist ministers have graduated from this Seminary. Mr. V. Prodan is the head of the Roumanian Department.

ments. They tend, wherever they go, to form their own neighborhoods. Thus they live not only in a spiritual communion, but also in an every-day contact, which enhances the mutual aid tendencies of their brotherhood.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS

All the different churches of the Roumanians have developed, within the last ten years, their respective parochial schools. These institutions, mainly established for the teaching of religion, aim also at preserving, for the second generation of Roumanians, their mother tongue and respect for their cultural traditions. They are far from competing with the American public schools. They are neither sufficient in number nor adequately equipped to undertake the whole education of the children. So that there may be no conflict with the public school program, these parochial schools are run only after school hours or on Saturday, and never for a longer period than one hour. In some places classes are held only once, in others, two or three times a week. During the summer months the school period is somewhat longer, and classes are held daily.

The priests, who are usually the teachers and the principals of these schools, are absorbed by their ministerial duties and devote only part of their time to the education of the young. Not all of them are familiar with modern methods in education and many fail to understand the character of the children born in the United States. They do not always succeed in stirring up a vital interest in their teaching. Some of them still resort to old-fashioned corporal punishment as a means of school discipline. This, in contrast to the up-to-date American methods in pedagogy, which advocate pleasurable activities and team work on the part of the teacher and the pupils, contributes to lessen the popularity of the parochial schools. However, in recent

years a more careful choice in the leaders of these schools has greatly raised the standards of teaching. There are at present over sixteen parochial schools connected with the Orthodox Churches,[1] eight with the Greek Catholic Churches and twelve with the Baptist Churches. The first Greek Catholic parochial school was started in 1911, in Scalp Level, Pennsylvania,[2] and has preceded all the others. But the Greek Catholic School in Detroit deserves special mention, because it is the only Roumanian School which carries out a full primary grade curriculum, half in English and half in Roumanian, with the approval of the Board of Education in Detroit. Besides these parochial schools there are a few independent institutions started under private initiative, either by individuals or clubs:

1. The School of Woonsocket (R. I.) started in 1924 under the auspices of the Macedonian Club "Roumanian Youth" with an enrolment of twenty-seven school children.

[1] These schools are: 1. The school of the "Descent of the Holy Spirit," in Philadelphia, founded in 1914. At present it holds two-hour classes, three times a week, with an attendance of 65 children. It also carries weekly lectures for the adults. 2. The school of St. John the Baptist, in Erie, Pa., started in 1920. It has a registration of 36 children. 3. St. Nicolas's School in Alliance, Ohio, founded in 1922 by Mr. A. Prie, the Grand President of the U. S. R. A. It also carries classes for children and adults. 4. "Queen Marie's School", in Indianapolis, instituted in 1922. It is attended by 70 pupils. 5. The school of the Holy Cross, in Canton, Ohio, with 80 pupils. 6. The school of Massilon, Ohio, founded in 1924 and attended by 65 pupils. 7. The school of South St. Paul, Minnesota, started in 1925, has classes only on Saturdays and an attendance of 35-40 children. 8. The school of the Resurrection, in Warren, Ohio, started in 1922, holds classes three times a week. 9. The Detroit School of the "Descent of the Holy Spirit," organized in 1922, with three classes a week. St. Mary's School in Cleveland, Eminescu in Woodlawn, Pennsylvania, and the schools of Akron, Ohio, and South Omaha, Nebraska and Farrell, Ohio, have been organized in the last two or three years. See *America*, no. 139, June 13, 1928, no 193, August 16, 1928.

[2] See Calendarul Ziarului, *America*, 1925, p. 166.

2. The School " Principele Carol " in Cleveland founded on November 25, 1925 by Miss L. Cucui, and attended by 80 children.

All these schools are helping the second generation of Roumanians to keep up the Roumanian language and to realize the value of their cultural heritage. They are instrumental in stirring up in the children born in the United States a feeling of pride and respect for their ethnic origin.

SOCIALIST CLUBS

While mutual help and church affiliation have been the basis of group cohesion among a large number of the Roumanian immigrants, a totally different set of ideas has become the rallying point of another group, the Roumanian Socialist workers. Abandoning their allegiance to the institutions of the Old Culture, to the State and to the Church, this group of Roumanian workers claims that social organization should be based on occupational interests rather than on what they consider fallacious ideas of cultural or ethnic traditions. Strong interest in an International Workers' Union, comprising all the workers of the world, brought about, in 1913-1914, the organization of the Federation of the Roumanian Socialist Workers of the United States. Tired perhaps by the continuous quarrels and misunderstandings arising between the Roumanian workers and the intelligentsia, or simply yielding to the propaganda carried on by Socialists in the factories, these radicals severed totally their connections with their compatriots. They affiliated themselves with the International Workers of the World and the Socialist Party,[1] and soon found themselves associating with Finns, Serbians, Russians and representatives of other nationalities. They were not long in discovering that they could not subscribe to all the ideas advocated by the Socialists. Handi-

[1] *The American Year Book*, 1927, p. 109.

capped by their limited knowledge of the English language, they felt that even with the American Socialists they held little in common and had little to gain, and that they were missing the opportunity to develop themselves. Gradually they broke away from the International Workers of the World and adopted the name of "Cultural Association of the Roumanian Workers." The Association has scarcely two hundred members throughout the United States, with about twenty sections, among which those of Cleveland, Chicago, Detroit and New York are the most active. They emphasize a cultural development and a knowledge of labor questions which will help them better to understand the implications of Socialism and how to carry them out. Their paper, the "Desteptarea" (The Awakening), started on January first, 1914, by Ion Cretsu,[1] has helped to keep them in close contact with each other. Its aggressive articles are filled with disdain for and mistrust of any government which is not based on people's representation and of any economic system which favors profits for the benefit of the few, instead of a "rightful redistribution" of the means of production and of consumption. It excels in bitter diatribes against royalty and the capitalistic system or in panegyrics on the work of the Soviet Government. However, the arrogant and militant attitude of the paper misrepresents the harmless activities of the Roumanian Socialists. Unsympathetic towards the violent methods of strikes, picketing and sabotage, they believe in evolution rather than in revolution. They are more interested in the cultural activities of their clubs[2] than in over-

[1] The "Awakening", number 6, year xiv, vol. xiv, March 15, 1927. The "Awakening", number 22, year xiv, vol. xiv, Nov. 15, 1927.

[2] The program of the Chicago Workers Club (2250 Clybourn Avenue) is a good example of the activities of such clubs. Organized in 1914 it has kept a membership fluctuating between 25 and 30 people, men and women. In its regular winter program, of weekly meetings, it carries out a series of lectures on Labor Problems. Industrial Democracy,

throwing the capitalistic system. They are mostly a group of utopian idealists, who advocate "a millenium in which every man and woman will be at work and rewarded according to merit instead of having, as at present times, a group of parasites preying upon the working classes." They wait patiently for the time to come when the workers will have in their hands control of the resources of the world. In the interim they enjoy the benefits of the capitalistic system, and most of them lead a very comfortable life. However, they are feared by all the other Roumanian workers on account of their former affiliations with the I. W. W. and are considered Bolsheviks. Their official breach with the Church discredits them as fearless atheists, and as they have retired from the Beneficial and Cultural Societies they are completely cut off from any social activity with the other Roumanians.

THE PRESS

The outstanding trait of the social organization of the Roumanians, common to all immigrants, is that for a period of over twenty years, up to 1928, the special allegiances and interests which formed the solid foundations upon which the sub-groups were built contributed to maintaining noticeable divisions. Faithful to its respective allegiance, to its cultural origin, its new interest in mutual help, or to its Church, each group pursued its own activities and development, only on rare occasions participating in the social activities of the whole Roumanian colony. This separation was perhaps a natural stage in the development of the groups compelled as they were by the necessity of strongly organizing the small

Profit Sharing, the Passing of the Capitalistic System, the Soviet Organization, Workers' Education are examples. It gives also theatrical performances whose subjects are closely connected with problems confronting the workers. No tendency toward violence nor feeling of hatred is found among them and their reverence for culture and higher learning commands respect.

units before throwing them into the complex network of a wider organization. The unifying factor playing upon these separate groups of Roumanians has undoubtedly been the Roumanian press. It is worth while sketching its development in order to gauge the difficulties it encountered in its efforts to bring the Roumanians into closer cooperation. The first step was taken in 1905, by private initiative, when Reverend E. Lucaciu printed, on the twenty-eighth of December, the "Romanul", the first Roumanian paper in the United States. Being a Catholic, Dr. Lucaciu undertook a campaign to unify all the Roumanian immigrants under the Greek Catholic Roumanian Church. But when Moise Balea, the first Orthodox missionary, arrived in the United States he saw the menace threatening the Orthodox Roumanians. To counteract the propaganda of Reverend Lucaciu, he started, on September first, 1906, the "America", which he named "the organ of the Roumanians of the United States, and specially of the Greek Oriental Churches", published when the time and the necessary funds were available. For a time a war was waged between the two papers on account of the religious differences among the Transylvanians, which had never before led to antagonistic factionalism.[1] In 1908-1909 the Union of the Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies of America bought the "America", which from that time on became the official organ of the Union. Reverend Lucaciu realizing that the conflict between the two papers could grievously affect the unity of the Roumanian immigrants, relinquished the struggle and sold the "Romanul" to a professional journalist. But the religious conflict soon turned into a class antagonism. The "America", as the organ of the Union, was considered the workers' paper. It was edited chiefly by people who had risen from the working class and who had little literary abil-

[1] Drutzu, S., *Romanii in America*, p. 196.

ity. The "Romanul", on the contrary, was edited by expert journalists, who secured the collaboration of the few intellectuals [1] among the Roumanians. The latter aspired to become the leaders of the Roumanian Workers. But they were discredited by a few unscrupulous swindlers in their group.[2] This unfortunate situation embittered the differences between the two classes. The intellectuals attacked the leaders of the workers with the following criticisms: that the Union of the Beneficial and Cultural Societies was not built on healthy and honorable bases, and that the administration of both the Union and the "Typographic Institute" (The Printing Establishment of the America) was inefficient. They further contended that the leaders of the Union were saloon-keepers and semi-intellectuals; that they had neither the call nor the necessary preparation to represent the Roumanians before the Americans, and that the editors of the newspaper "America" were lacking in education and could not direct and promote public opinion.[3] The leaders of the workers responded to these attacks with the following contentions: that the intellectuals desired to prey upon the Roumanian workers, and had already cheated them by selling fictitious stock and non-existing land; that they were too few

[1] The group of intellectuals included not more than 30 persons, made up of seven or eight professional men, four or five priests and seventeen or eighteen clerks or tradesmen from the Old Country. (See *Calendarul, America,* 1925, p. 50.)

[2] Some of these swindlers pretended to have mines of gold, silver or copper; others, land containing oil; others were interested in airplanes. They all issued stock and travelled from colony to colony selling it. Some sold stock in a bank they were going to found in Sharon, Ohio, and took subscriptions to a newspaper, *Tribune,* which only appeared three times. Another, claiming he was collecting money to support the newspaper *Lupta,* the organ of the National Roumanian Party in Transylvania, greatly abused the confidence of his compatriots. (See Calendarul, *America,* 1925, p. 51.)

[3] See Calendarul, *America,* 1925, p. 53.

in number to be represented in the Union. They also claimed that the priests should "stay within the altar" and not drink in the saloons; that the intellectuals were sold to Francis Joseph, as they were going daily to the Austrian-Hungarian consulates; that the saloon-keepers had instituted the great number of societies and even the parishes, and that the people must have a free government, with representatives elected from their midst.[1] The conflict became so intense that it aroused the indignation of even the Roumanians across the ocean. Dr. Ion Suciu, then Deputy and Secretary of the National Party of the Transylvanians, made the following request: "We beg you to put an end to your quarrels and misunderstandings, and specially to your journalistic quarrels. The honour of the Nation asks that from you."[2] But the conflict culminated in a skirmish. At the annual meeting of the Union of the Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies (U. S. R. A.) in 1922, held in Cleveland, the representatives of the workers voted upon the acceptance of Article IV of the Constitution of the U. S. R. A.,[3] which excluded altogether the intellectuals from their midst. The latter, in retaliation, attacked the headquarters of the newspaper and smashed all the windows. But this struggle to obtain the leadership of the Roumanian colonies was lost. Despite the bitter campaign the intellectuals pursued in the "Romanul" against the "America" and its leaders, they did not succeed in hindering the progress of the latter paper. By 1916 the circulation of "America" was 8500,[4] reaching 10,500 on November twelfth largely on account of the entrance of Roumania into the World War and of the great

[1] See Calendarul, *America*, 1925, p. 54.

[2] *America*, no. 45, June 20, 1909.

[3] Drutzu, S., *Romanii in America*, p. 198.

[4] *America*, no. 69, August 27, 1916.

interest thus aroused among the Roumanians in the United States. It dropped considerably in the following years, but reached its peak in 1928, with 20,091 copies [1] in circulation. The prolonged quarrel between the "America" and "Romanul" ended recently in the friendly collaboration of the two newspapers. Thanks to the merger of the Union and the League, the two papers have become the official organs of the Union and the League of Roumanian Societies.[2] Since April 15, 1928, the "Romanul" appears as the Sunday weekly of the Union, while the "America" continues to be the only Roumanian daily outside Roumania. Despite the antagonistic feelings and the regrettable incidents which at first kept the "America" and the "Romanul" at swords' points, the press was influential in building up the group consciousness of the Roumanian immigrants and in helping them to close their ranks.

For a period of twenty-three years *America* endeavored to unite the Roumanians in a community of thought. Isolated in the different cities and without the possibility of knowing of the existence of many of their brothers, *America* helped them to strengthen their group consciousness and to guide their social and cultural development not only in relation to old allegiances but also in harmony with the demands of their American environment. The variety of news appearing in its columns [3] shows that *America* has followed step by step the

[1] N. W. Ayer and Son, *American Newspaper Annual and Directory*, 1928.

[2] *Romanul*, no. 16, vol. xxvi, April 15, 1928.

[3] The news given by *America* has been analyzed for a period of two years, January 1, 1927-December 31, 1928, and classified under the following heads: (1) News about the Old Country; (2) American news; (3) International news; (4) Miscellaneous; (5) Activities of the Roumanian societies; (6) Advertisements. The Old Country news occupies the greatest newspaper space. Prior to the war, news about Hungary was as common as that about Roumania, because the interests of the

development of the Roumanian immigrants, endeavoring to

Transylvanians were tied up with the fate of the Hungarian Monarchy. The administration of the Hungarian government (see *America,* no. 9, 1906), in regard to its treatment of the Transylvanians and the strivings of the latter for political recognition were the main subjects of the current events and the editorials. At present, the claims of the Magyar nobility to the *latifundia* existing within the new boundaries of Greater Roumania and the intervention of Lord Rothermere (see *America,* no. 287-306, Dec., 1927; also no. 13, Jan., 1927, 282-287; 290-301, in 1927; no. 42-43, Feb., 1928), receive as much consideration as the debates in the Roumanian Parliament, the attacks on Mr. Bratiano's administration, or the success of the Peasants Party and of Mr. I. Maniu, in power at this time. Special attention is given to the Peasants Party in Roumania, with which the Transylvanians are in full sympathy, because it originated in Transylvania under the leadership of Dr. Maniu.

The home news about America relates chiefly to the questions of immigration, industrial legislation and labor conditions. In recent years the questions of citizenship (see *America,* nos. 85-92, 102-105, 1928) and of elections (nos. 81-93, 1928) have received special consideration and practical advice has been given to the readers. The international news is less voluminous, but refers to the main developments throughout the world, in the economic, cultural and political fields. The miscellaneous items include hygienic hints to mothers, accidents and crimes. The activities of the Roumanian societies take up considerable space. The whole last page of the paper is devoted to them. Minutes of committee meetings, agendas, programs of fairs and fetes, financial statements, addresses of the Roumanian societies, personal notes regarding marriages, deaths, christenings, receive due attention. The advertisements are relatively few in number and deal chiefly with steamship agencies, banks, professional men, opportunities for work, *searcher cases,* etc.

America is unique, because in Roumania there are no newspapers maintained by the workers to meet their needs. The majority of papers are edited by intellectuals, well versed in politics and social questions, who are capable, through their editorials, to direct the public opinion and to make a sound criticism of a given situation.

America is edited by Roumanian intellectuals, who have always to keep in mind that their readers are not equipped for deep sociological discussions. Consequently *America* aims not at literary successes but at giving information, especially regarding the vital interests of the majority of the Roumanians in the United States, such as news of their ethnic organizations, social contacts with the American community, or of political conditions in the Old Country.

The language of *America* is simple and direct. Any one who has

stir up their pride in their ethnic origin and helping them to become better citizens of the United States. It has led them out of the chaos of disorganization, suspicion and distrust into a state of conscious citizenship and has made them aware of their rights and responsibilities, capable of discerning between evil and good, between selfishness and devoted service. Perhaps the fairest appreciation of the *America* comes from the pen of one of its former opponents, who, responding to an attack directed against this daily, wrote: "*America* represents for us not only a moral but also a material basis. We will build around it a wall and we will defend it." [1]

Besides the *America* and *Romanul,* which are still sharing the favors of the Roumanian immigrants, there have been a great number of other newspapers and magazines [2]

some interesting point of view to express has a chance to have an article printed on the front page. It is really a democratic, popular paper and due consideration must be given to the fact, that even when the editor-in-chief dissents from the opinion advanced by one of the contributors, the latter's article receives the necessary space. Its present circulation is over 20,000.

[1] See *Romanul,* no. 9, years xxv, March 6, 1927.

[2] The list of other publications which are discontinued at present includes: The *Tribuna* (the Tribune), was a daily published in Cleveland, in 1903 for a very short time, just to allow its proprietor to issue stock; the *Ecoul American* (the American Echo), started in 1904, in New York City but was discontinued after its third issue; the *Steaua noastra* (Our Star), published weekly in New York City from 1911-1924, by a Roumanian Jew; the *Glasul Vremei* (the Knell of Time), was the organ of the Roumanian Greek Orthodox Priests, edited in Youngstown from 1912-1916; the *Desteaptate Romane* (Awake, thee, Roumanian), a weekly first published in 1912, discontinued in 1917, because its proprietor was connected with the Secret Service of the Central European powers. It was a pro-Magyar paper, written in the vernacular of the Roumanians from Bihor and Satmar, which has a great number of Hungarian words in it; the *Unirea* (the Union), sustaining the Roumanian Greek Catholics was impartial in its treatment of ethnic questions. It appeared in Youngstown from 1915-1916; the *Sentinela* (the Sentry) a weekly of very serious character, appeared in Indianapolis in 1916, but its second editor filled it with biblical quotations and lost the interest and

appearing at different times, and for longer or shorter periods,

financial support of its readers; the *Progresul* (the Progress) appeared in Detroit, from 1916-1917. It was a weekly written in a choicer Roumanian but it ridiculed the national peasant costumes of the Roumanians in the U. S., attacked violently the editors of the *America* and could not pursue its publication beyond 1917; the *Transilvania* a weekly paper, was published from 1917-1918, as the organ of the "National Committee" organized by the Roumanian Greek Orthodox Priests against the leaders of the Union of the Beneficial and Cultural Societies; the *Ecoul American* (the American Echo) first a weekly, then a bi-monthly became the *Curierul American* (the American Mail) of the Roumanian Macedonians; the *Dreptatea* (the Righteousness), appeared only six times, in 1922 in Youngstown, as a protest against the seeming fraudulent conduct of the officials of the Union of the Beneficial and Cultural Societies. When the misunderstanding and suspicion were cleared away at the Erie Convention of the fraternal organizations, the paper was suspended; the *Vocea Poporului* (the People's Voice), a temporary newspaper, issued in Indiana Harbor in 1923, to sustain a priest ordained by the Russian Bishop of New York City, was chiefly a factional paper which had only six issues; the *Tribuna* (the Tribune), a weekly edited in Detroit, in 1923, during a period of 2 months, was well written but rather shallow; the *Posta* (the Post), a commercial weekly, written half in English half in Roumanian, in May 1924, did not last beyond the presidential election of that year, its proprietor, an American, not understanding the Roumanians and their needs; *Alright*, a humorous and literary magazine appeared in Cleveland in 1908-1909 and played a great role in the organization of the fraternal societies; *Ecoul Americei* (the Echo of America) monthly magazine, appeared only for a few months in 1910; *Calicul American* (the Poor American), a monthly humorous periodical, was published from 1909 to 1916, by intelligent workingmen to defend the cause of the Union of the Roumanian fraternal organizations; the *Urzica* (the Nettle), another satirical monthly appeared in 1915, in Weirton, W. Va., then in Martins Ferry, Ohio, from 1915 to 1917. Like the Calicul American it attacked with sarcasm the "domnii" (or intelligentsia) and especially the priests; the *Familia* (the Family), a monthly appeared only four times, in Detroit, in 1917; the *America Literara* (the Literary America) started in 1917, was discontinued in 1918; it was the best monthly review, but too expensive for the general Roumanian readers; *Roumania*, an English-Roumanian review, appeared for a whole year, in 1917, in Chicago; explaining to the American public the situation of Roumania in the World War and her national aspirations; the *Ortodoxul Român* (the Roumanian Orthodox), a religious monthly re-

according to the support given by the community and to the reality of the needs they were meeting. Those have survived which answered the strong interests of their subscribers, either religious or patriotic, such as: the *Foia Poporului* (the People's Paper), started in 1913, and still published in Cleveland. It has been for a time the official organ of the Union of the Roumanian Greek Catholic Societies, but this function was taken away by the *Buletinul Oficial.* It is a simply-written popular weekly, for those who have had a limited education. The *Deșteptarea* (the Awakening), a weekly published in Detroit since 1914, the organ of the Roumanian socialist workers in America. The *Samanatorul* (the Sower), a religious monthly review first published in 1915 in Youngstown. Before the war it directed its attacks against those who aspired to the leadership of the Union of the Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies. But since the Armistice it has changed its policy and has continuously presented a program of radical church reform, for the socialization of the Roumanian Greek Orthodox Church. It is published, now, in Roumania. The *Tribuna* (the Tribune), a weekly which appeared in Chicago in 1915, ceased regular publication in 1918 but still appears occasionally, when there is enough money to cover expenses; the *Creștinul* (the Christian), a monthly Baptist review for religious propaganda, started in 1917 in Detroit; the *Vagabondul* (the Tramp), a satirical

view, appeared in 1908, in Canton, Ohio, three or four times only; *Săgeata* (the Arrow), a satirical monthly conducted against the Union of the Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies and against the daily *America,* was published thrice in Cleveland and once or twice in Detroit, in 1922; the *Lumina* (the Light), the official organ of the Association of the Roumanian Greek Orthdox Priests, ordained in New York, was published in 1922 with a view to pointing out that the priests ordained by the Russian Bishop of New York, had the same rights to officiate as those ordained in the Old Country. It was discontinued after four months. (See Calendarul Ziarului, *America,* 1925, pp. 135-154.)

monthly review issued in Erie, Pa., since 1922; the *Curierul American* (the American Mail), a weekly of a more substantial character, the organ of the Roumanian-Macedonians edited since 1923; the *Adevarul* (the Truth), a religious monthly review started in 1924, the organ of the Union of the Roumanian Greek Catholic Societies of America and the *Buletinul Oficial* (the Official Bulletin), a quarterly of the same organization; the *Crocudilul* (the Crocodile), a journal of humor published monthly in Cleveland since 1928; and finally the *Luminatorul* (the Illuminator), the monthly of the Roumanian Baptists, published in East Orange, New Jersey. But none of these publications has retained with as much force and understanding, as the *America,* the unflagging interest of the Roumanians. None has built as strong an organization for its support to carry it through financial vicissitudes. The *America* can well be considered the crossroads where Transylvanians, Roumanian-Macedonians and immigrants from the Old Kingdom meet to exchange their experiences and to receive the inspiration which will lead them to higher activities.

To the unifying influence of *America* must be added the slow but effective influence of the long-drawn-out struggle carried on by the leaders of the Beneficial and Cultural Societies of both the Union and the League (Liga și Ajutorul), exercised with a view to strengthening their organization and to uniting all the Roumanians into one central organization, irrespective of creed or regional allegiance. The laudable efforts of the present Grand President of the Union and the League are already crowned with success. Within the last year a considerable change has taken place in the relations between the different groups of Roumanians, a change which marks an advance step in the evolution of their group life. The differences in regional origins and to some extent in religious affiliations tend to be forgotten before the

stronger feeling of the unity of their cultural origin.[1] Since the merger of the Union and the League, the old antagonism between the two sets of similar if not identical organizations have officially disappeared. The spirit of cooperation, so characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon, is gaining ground daily. In cities where there are two or three societies, as in Cleveland, Youngstown and Chicago, fulfilling the same needs, the tendency is to combine their resources and activities in order to avoid overlapping and competition in securing a wider membership. Cooperation has become to the Roumanians not only the keynote to their ethnic consciousness but also the condition *sine qua non* which would command the esteem of the Americans. The regional or religious groups, which hitherto have kept apart, jealously maintaining their clannish divisions, are brought more and more into cooperation. There is a tendency toward a united Roumanian colony rather than a maintenance of neighborhoods of Transylvanians, Bukovinians, Roumanian Baptists or Greek Catholics.[2] Thus in its evolutionary development, the inte-

[1] An example of this consciousness, superseding allegiance to regional origin, is that of the recent collaboration of the Roumanian colonies in Chicago, East Chicago and Indiana Harbor, which joined forces to collect funds for the erection of an "Old People's and Orphans' Home". Six societies: *Transilvana, Sperantsa, Tricolorul şi Independentsa Română, Raza Luminei, Maior L. D. Teiuşeanu* and *Falnicul Zarand*, grouping Roumanians from Banat, Bukovina and Transylvania, both Greek Orthodox and Greek Catholics, combined efforts for the success of the fete.

[2] Groups of varied regional origin, have shown an inclination to coalesce and forget their former differences. This is noticeable among th Bukovinians, Banatians and Transylvanians in Detroit; the Macedonians, Transylvanians and Roumanians from the Old Kingdom, in Indianapolis; and the Roumanians, Transylvanians and Banatians in Cleveland. The Bukovinians, who have kept aloof from the Roumanian fraternal organizations, are seeking their cooperation. Already those of Detroit have entered the Union. The Roumanian Baptists have discussed the possible ways of collaborating with the Union, at their annual

gration of the Roumanian immigrants has passed from the stage of village allegiance to that of ethnic group consciousness extending not only to the local ethnic units derived from face-to-face contacts, but also to a broader consciousness, resulting from the realization of a cultural unity as Roumanians.

The process of rebuilding the national consciousness of aliens thrust upon American soil is a phenomenon common to all immigrants.[1] It results from a natural protective impulse of a dislocated group to rebuild its cohesion along the line of the old culture affinities and primary group associations and also from the liberal policy of the American Democracy in dealing with the ethnic minorities coming into its territory. This policy of non-interference leaves each ethnic group the freedom to develop its own organization and to assert itself in the community, while the public school and the force of the American environment pursue their work of assimilation. Thanks to this apparent independence enjoyed by each group, the Roumanians, like the others, have evolved their own social organizations, released leadership from among themselves, freed latent energies and dormant potentialities, and thus, having integrated socially, are getting ready to participate more fully in the larger life of the American community. The recent strong tendency on the part of the various groups to unite and to cooperate in many activities and interests is itself a most potent influence toward hastening the process of assimilation.

Convention, in September (see *America,* no. 193, August 16, 1928), and the Roumanian Macedonians gave full consideration to this problem at the twenty-fifth year Jubilee of the Society Farsherotul, held in New York City, on November 3 and 4, 1928. As to the Greek Catholics, they have no objection to closer relationships with the other Roumanians, so long as their religious integrity is not impaired.

[1] See Capek, T., *The Cechs in America,* 1920, pp. 241-264.

CHAPTER VII

The Development of New Community Contacts

The building up of strong national associations among the Roumanians in the United States might easily be objected to by the advocates of Americanization as thwarting the assimilative process, on the ground that it reinforces the tendency towards segregation, common to all ethnic groups. The error, however, of this contention lies in the fact that it assumes segregation to be inherently a defect in an immigrant group because it counteracts the process of assimilation and that it considers complete segregation as possible. But segregation, far from being a *defect,* is the result of the natural Law of Selection, which permits the survival of a given ethnic group by isolating it sufficiently from other groups to retain among its members a strong feeling of group consciousness.

As to complete segregation, that is impossible to attain, for no ethnic group in the complex interdependence of modern life, and especially in the intricate network of the American community, can live wholly unto and within itself. Consequently, far from condemning the national integration of the Roumanians as an isolating factor and a hindrance to assimilation, it must be understood as a necessary transition, a stepping-stone which helps the individual immigrant gradually to realize himself, to understand the social implications of his American environment, and later to go a step further in his social integration by merging into the broader American life.

There are numerous instances showing the effect of the Roumanian ethnic organizations upon the assimilation of individual members, as well as upon the whole group. Every one of the eighty-two Beneficial and Cultural Societies can claim the honor of having helped to initiate its members into a better understanding of their duties as citizens of the United States.[1]

Were it not for the social control exercised by his ethnic group, the Roumanian immigrant might easily become an anti-social individual. Thrust into the midst of the American environment with which he is totally unfamiliar, unaware of the legal concepts prevailing among Americans, and ignorant of the English language, he might easily break loose from any social constraint were he severed from the socializing influence of his ethnic group. But any such tendency is held in check by the approval or disapproval of his compatriots. In this way the national organization of the Roumanians, as a factor of social control, has been very effective for the maintenance of order within the larger American community; and any segregation to which it gave rise, helped the process of assimilation, though in an indirect way. Left to themselves, thanks to the American policy of non-intervention and to the isolating tendencies of other national groups, the Roumanians realized that they had to reach the American level in order to have an honorable place in the ethnic mosaic of the American community.

The stimulating example of the few who adapted them-

[1] It will suffice to mention but the work of the Society Sperantza, in Chicago, out of which grew in 1916 the "Roumanian Politico-Democratic Social Club" for educating its members better to use the franchise; the work of the Societies Carpatina and Dr. Anghelescu in Cleveland, who have helped their members and the whole Roumanian Colony in Cleveland to become better acquainted with the American institutions in the City by establishing contacts with the Public Library, the Y. W. C. A. the Political Clubs; and the work of Avram Iancu in N. Y. C.

selves more rapidly than the others to the American environment; the group effort in sharing the experience acquired and in reaching out for a higher standard of living; the effect of national pride in keeping untainted the Roumanian name; the legitimate desire to prove to Americans that Roumanians are as good and as law-abiding as any other national group—all these factors have ultimately although unconsciously helped the process of assimilation. A legitimate aspiration towards a higher life coupled with the desire to be worthy of American citizenship has enable the Roumanians to draw nearer American standards and gradually to adopt the civilization and culture of America. Moreover, while the ethnic associations of the Roumanians contribute to the betterment of every individual immigrant, they do not necessarily create an isolating wall around him. Only part of his life is absorbed by the social and recreational activities of his group. In every walk of life, in every phase of his development, the Roumanian, like any other immigrant, makes new contacts, which bring him more fully into the American environment. Thus, due to personal initiative and stimulated cooperation, the strong barrier of nationalism is broken down and the new culture, filtering through the old, gradually supersedes it until complete assimilation takes place.

The most valuable of these new contacts established by the younger generation of Roumanians, is undoubtedly that with the public schools, whose effect, as a means of inculcating the new civilization and culture, is well recognized.[1] It has been impossible to measure statistically the total number of school contacts made by the Roumanians.[2] As far as

[1] See Roberts, P., *The Problem of Americanization*, 1910; Bogardus, *Essentials of Americanization*, Un. of S. Calif., 1920; Miller, H. A. and Park, R. E., *Old World Traits Transplanted*, 1921; Miller, H. A., *The School and the Immigrant*, 1916.

[2] Figures of the Board of Education for each city are classified ac-

inquiries were made in regard to school attendance, all the children were reported as attending public schools, though some of them were also in parochial schools after school hours. All of the 76 children of school age in the 100 Roumanian families in Chicago were attending public schools and 9 of these were also in the parochial school of the Greek Orthodox Roumanian Church.

The advantages of the American schools with their wealth of subject-matter and their up-to-date methods are so obvious, that it is not merely a passive conformity to the American laws of compulsory education, which impels the Roumanian parents to send their children to these schools but also a keen appreciation of their superiority. The effect of school contacts upon the Roumanian families is very marked. The children learning the English language become the carriers of the new language and new ideas into the Roumanian home. They interpret to their parents the American standards of health, economic efficiency, civic duties and fair play. They explain to them the history of the American people and the formation of the American nation. The following stories will illustrate this point. Mrs. P. from Detroit volunteered the following information:

cording to color not according to race. It has been therefore, impossible to secure data regarding the Roumanian School Children. However, the Immigration Commission in 1908 investigating conditions found that 1,265 Roumanian children reported as attending public school in 37 cities (see *Abstract of Reports of Immigration Commission*, vol. ii, 1911, p. 10), 135 children were in parochial school in 24 cities (see *ibid.*, pp. 64, 65) and 13 students were in higher educational institutions, aside from the 96 Hebrew Roumanian students pursuing higher learning (see *ibid.*, pp. 76, 77). In 1926 the number of children in parochial schools was 1,370, in 18 churches reporting data, as compared with 123 children in 1916, in only 2 schools (see *U. S. Census Bureau, Census of Religious Bodies*, 1926, Eastern Orthodox Churches, Washington, D. C., 1929, p. 24). The number of Roumanian non-Jewish students, attending High School was 33 for 1926 and those registered in Colleges or Universities, 24. (See *Calendarul Național al Ziarului America*, 1927, pp. 97, 98.)

I began to learn English because I did not want my two girls to be ahead of me and later, perhaps, be ashamed of my inability to speak the language of the Americans. I often find it difficult to keep up with them, for they can learn faster than myself. But it is fun to learn things one does not know.

Mrs. T's seventeen years old daughter, who is in high school, in Cleveland, teaches her mother English and tries to keep her in touch with everything she is taught. It is wonderful [said the mother], to see how much the children know about the practical issues of life—trade, book keeping, transactions, raw materials. It took me nearly my whole life-time to learn the trade of keeping a store and now my daughter learns as much or more in her school days.

Besides the school contacts the Roumanian children help to break down the isolation of their group through their connections with the playground. It is on the common plane of fair play and team work that they meet the others from within or around their neighborhood and make new bonds of friendship.

In Chicago, through the City Playground at Wrightwood and Lilly Streets, in the vicinity of the Clybourn-Fullerton district, the Roumanian children have developed a baseball team and take part in all the school contests of the city. Thus these children are brought into closer touch with those of other nationalities and have interested their parents in the city-wide athletic activities.[1]

But while the children are establishing valuable contacts with the American environment, the adults are also getting better adjusted through conscious efforts. In every Rou-

[1] During an interview with Mrs. P., in Chicago, the radio was on and made such a noise that it was impossible to carry on the conversation. "I am sorry for the noise," said Mrs. P. in an apologetic way; "but my son is interested in the issue of the game, which goes on now. He is for the Giants. He was on the school team last year and he got us also interested in these American games."

manian colony one finds the exceptional individual who pursues his work together with his intellectual improvement.[1] But there are few formally enrolled in night schools, either in the public schools or in the Y. W. C. A. and Y. M. C. A. The number is so small that repeatedly those who have charge of the classes in Americanization cannot give figures regarding Roumanians. This was true in Detroit, Chicago, Trenton and Youngstown. However, the Roumanian press, realizing the value of adult education and of the knowledge of English in the American community, has endeavored to stimulate the interest of the Roumanians, by giving much publicity to night schools and English classes. Cleveland [2] seems to have the most active Roumanian colony taking advantage of the educational opportunities provided by the city, and consequently it receives a great deal of publicity. Similar efforts in other Roumanian centers are less well known, either because the number of those attending evening classes is extremely small or because the local groups make no effort to bring their cultural achievements to the knowledge of the press. There is, for instance, in Chicago, a small group of seven people (including a tailor and his wife, two artists, an electrician and his wife and a sixty-five-year-old woman,[3] engaged in the clothing industry) who are regularly attending the English classes held at the Waller

[1] Mr. P., in Trenton, has taught himself English by reading the newspaper aloud. He had taken lessons with a private teacher for only one month.

[2] See *America*, no. 79, April 4, 1927, no. 222, September, 1927, nos. 235, 236 and October, 1927.

[3] When asked at what time she was likely to be home, from the factory, this woman replied: "I am in, daily, after 6 p. m., but never on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays. I am going to school and I would never want to miss my classes. I can say, now, as many words as my young Polish classmate. But just because I am the eldest in the class I want to show the teacher that I can do as well as the young."

Technical School. But there is no publicity in the Roumanian press to interest a greater number of Roumanians in Chicago to attend such classes, nor is there an organized effort on the part of the Americans to attract more Roumanians to night schools. The only publicity in that connection is that of the personal example of the small group of seven.

In Detroit, the stimulus to attend English classes has come from the International Institute in collaboration with the Americanization Bureau. The majority of those attending are women, nine of them having had regular attendance throughout the winter of 1926-1927.[1]

In Akron, Ohio, the efforts of the International Institute in drawing the Roumanians to English classes have received little response, for only three to four persons attended them.

In Trenton, New Jersey, the same organization has been more successful, perhaps on account of its accessibility to the Roumanian neighborhood. Eleven people had registered for the English classes throughout the school year 1926-1927.

In Pittsburgh the contacts established by the International Institute are of a social service character. But the relationship which exists between the Roumanian colonies on the outskirts of Pittsburgh and the members of the Institute shows that, as in Detroit, the human factors involved in those contacts are more important than in the superficial ties created by the artificially stimulated activities among different ethnic groups. In general only a very small number of Roumanians in each colony attend night schools, and the contacts thus established do not last long. There is among the adult Roumanians, as in every other immigrant group, a feeling of constraint and a strong self-consciousness which prevents them from showing in public what they consider

[1] From verbal statements made by the Director of the International Institute.

" their social and cultural inferiority." [1] Consequently the majority of those who sign up for classes drop out as soon as they discover that they cannot keep up with the others or progress more rapidly than the slowly advancing group. However, the daily *America* with exaggerated optimism praises the Roumanians for their knowledge of English: " The Roumanians of America, with the exception of those who are illiterate, read English. There is no one who does not buy an American paper. Those who have lived in America know this truth." [2] Despite this glowing tribute paid to their knowledge of English, acquired in night schools or at home, it is doubtful whether they have such a command of the language as to enjoy reading. The Chief Librarians of the Public Libraries in Trenton, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Detroit and Chicago stated that it was impossible to ascertain whether the Roumanians were using the Public Library, because no records of the readers are kept on the basis of race. The fact that they are not using the Public Libraries came out in interviews with working people. Only the students or the few intellectuals take advantage of this opportunity that most American cities provide for their inhabitants. Through the efforts of these few intellectuals the Public Libraries of New York, Cleveland, Detroit and Chicago have a fairly adequate collection of Roumanian books. The Cleveland Library has even made an effort to attract the Roumanians to make use of its premises. It keeps in its foreign section copies of Roumanian newspapers and from time to time arranges festivals and lectures in English about

[1] " If we could only have been by ourselves ", confessed Mrs. V. in Detroit, " we would have improved our English in a very short time and a greater number would have attended classes. But we feel embarrassed to make mistakes before the Greeks, the Hungarians or the Italians."

[2] See *America*, no. 303, December 27, 1927.

Roumanian literature, history or art, which are attended by the Roumanians in that city.

But while the contacts of adults with either the public school or the library are infrequent, those established through their daily work are numerous and occasionally lead to close friendships, as is illustrated by the following stories.

Mrs. P., in Chicago, has two devoted friends, a Russian and an Irish woman, both of them formerly fellow workers in Hart, Schaffner and Marx clothing establishment. These two friends with their husbands and children attend all the Roumanian gatherings and feasts, though they know no Roumanian.

Another Roumanian family, that of Mrs. S., in Chicago, is very much devoted to a Polish family. The men have been working together for years in the stockyards and a strong friendship resulted from this daily contact and interchange of ideas.

It is also through their occupational contacts that the Roumanians are getting into touch with the trade unions and so are coming to understand American working-class standards. In the hundred families studied in Chicago, thirty-two of the hundred and seventy-three men and women over eighteen years of age employed in gainful occupations were members of trade unions. This number, which represents 18.4 per cent of the Roumanian workers under consideration, is quite significant, especially when compared with the total absence of trade-union affiliations among one hundred and forty-one Roumanians employed in the manufacturing and mining industries reporting data to the Immigration Commission investigating in 1908.[1] But these figures must not be interpreted too hastily, for the participation of the Roumanians in trade unions does not necessarily indicate their degree of assimilation, because it is rather passive.

[1] See *Abstracts of Reports of Immigration Commission*, 1911, vol. i, p. 418.

They become members of these labor organizations not out of conviction [1] but chiefly because it is a question of joining the union or of getting no work. The preferential agreements which some industries have with unions almost force workmen to become union members, as non-union men are the last to be hired, the first to be laid off in slack time, and never receive preferred treatment.[2] The cement workers belong to the Building Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor; those employed in the men's clothing industry, to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; the teamsters, to the Chicago Helpers and Teamsters Union; those working in breweries, to the International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal and Soft Drink Workers of America, etc. Through conversation with the Roumanian workers and interviews or correspondence with employers it appears that contacts with labor organizations are often of a compulsory nature and often are of little significance to the Roumanian workers, because they are not always linguistically equipped to take advantage of the educational opportunities that labor organizations offer and to establish stronger ties with the English-speaking workers.

In the economic field the contacts that the Roumanians establish through insurance companies [3] are of a more recent period. It took them a long time to realize the value of insurance, because in the old country it is an institution used more by the middle-class people than by the peasants, though

[1] Some declared with pride their membership in a union. But others without begrudging monthly dues varying from two to three dollars, said: "we cannot secure work without the union's membership card, so that whether we want to or not we have to join the union."

[2] See *The Hart, Schaffner and Marx Labor Agreement* renewed and revised 1922, 1925, Chicago, 1922, p. 12.

[3] Reference is made here to the contacts with the American Insurance companies and not to the policies carried with the Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies.

the workmen's compensation for industrial accidents through insurance methods (Asigurarile Muncitoresti) dates back to 1908-1913. The number of those who carry insurance policies varies with their earnings and their understanding of the advantages that insurance offers. Holding a policy with the Roumanian beneficial and cultural societies does not exclude the possibility of carrying also an insurance policy with an American company. Often those who are provident enough to join the Roumanian societies take additional insurance. Of the 173 workers interviewed in Chicago, 49 held death and accident insurance policies with the Roumanian beneficial and cultural societies. Eight of these also carried policies with American insurance companies. Only 9 held commercial insurance policies without being at the same time members of the Roumanian fraternal organizations.

As to the contacts established with the banks, they date back to the armistice period. Prior to that time the Roumanians kept their savings in their trunks, their shoes or on themselves, not daring to trust them to the savings banks. However, when they discovered that it was not safe to carry money about, they decided to make use of the banks, either for keeping their savings or making the financial transactions needed for sending money home. In each of the large cities where the Roumanians have settled they have come in touch with either one or two banks that they all patronize, either because the confidence of the few has spread to the many or because a Roumanian is employed by these banks to interpret to his countrymen the banking transactions. In Philadelphia, Akron, and Cleveland the contacts with banks are limited to the Roumanian institutions, because in every one of these cities there is a Roumanian bank.[1] In the other cities the Roumanians have

[1] The Marian Bank in Philadelphia; the Foreign Exchange Bank (A. Chima Prop.) in Akron; the Roumanian Bank in Cleveland; John Pora Co., in Indiana Harbor, Indiana, and Bank B. Poloshan, in Detroit.

made connections with the American banks. In Detroit it is the Highland Park Savings Bank; in Youngstown, the First National Bank and the Dollar Savings & Trust Co.; in Alliance, the Peoples Bank Co.; in New York, the Chrissoveloni Bank, the Emil Kiss Bank (4th Ave. and 9th St.) and the "Casa Romana" of Mr. A. Neder.

Interests other than economic help to draw the Roumanians out of their ethnic group and to destroy their seeming isolation. Usually the religious affiliations, as a basis for outside contacts, are stronger with the Roumanian Catholics. There are no organized inter-group activities between the Roumanian Greek Catholics and their co-religionists the Roman Catholics of the American community. But besides the official relations, of an administrative and spiritual nature, between the Roumanian prelates of the Greek Catholic faith and the Roman Catholic Bishop of Cleveland, the individual Roumanian belonging to the Greek Catholic Church is often drawn to his Roman Catholic neighbors, the Hungarian or the Polish.[1] The strong allegiance of the Roumanian Baptists to their Church allows them to establish friendly relations with the American Baptists of Serbian, Bulgarian or Croatian descent. But even the Roumanians of Greek Orthodox faith, who are not assiduous church-goers, often make new contacts, on the basis of their religious beliefs, with the other members of the community. Thus, since the early years of their arrival in the United States they have been drawn to the Serbians, the Greeks or the Russians, whose churches and priests they have used when they did not have their own. Even now they maintain friendly ties, though they only meet on rare occasions, such as that of the inauguration of the Roumanian Greek Orthodox Church in

[1] Mrs. Z. from Youngstown stated that her children's intimate friends were of Hungarian descent, their religious affiliation being the basis of this friendship.

Niles, to which all the Greeks and the Serbians of the vicinity were cordially invited.

Passing from religious to political interests, it is worth noticing that the Roumanians are building up, by degrees, stronger and stronger connections. In the past the political contacts were only with the "political bosses," who endeavored to get votes without caring to educate the immigrants to a better use of the franchise. Nowadays both the American political leaders and the Roumanian press are trying to interpret American politics in such a neutral and unbiased way as to help the elector to decide upon the worthiness of the candidate and to make his choice accordingly. Prior to the elections, meetings are held at which bilingual speeches are delivered by the American politicians and the Roumanian leaders. Out of these contacts strong and friendly acquaintances result. The Roumanians are becoming familiar with the spirit of the American community, and they also have the opportunity of showing the American leaders and officials that they can be dealt with as an organized group which can carry out the civic and political responsibilities which are entrusted to it.[1]

On all public occasions, such as the commemoration of a national event, the annual convention of the Union of the Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies (U. S. R. A.), the inauguration of a church, or the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the annexation of Transylvania to Roumania, the American authorities are often represented. At the 1927 annual convention of the U. S. R. A. in Cleveland, the

[1] A few Roumanians are successfully fulfilling public charges and public offices. In Chicago, the Public Health Commissioner is of Roumanian descent. In Youngstown the assistant Police Commissioner is Roumanian. In Columbus the assistant to the Attorney General is Roumanian. Many more public offices and charges have been held by the Roumanian Jews who are older settlers and who have a higher percentage of intellectuals among them.

mayor of the city, a district Judge and other officials appeared with the representatives of the Roumanian Legation in Washington, D. C. The mayor of Canton, Ohio, Mr. Stanford M. Swartz, attended the banquet given for the twentieth jubilee of the Society, "Traian si Cultura,"[1] and delivered a speech praising the Roumanians as law-abiding citizens. At the anniversary[2] of the Roumanian Women's Association of Detroit the mayor, Mr. John Smith, declared that "the Roumanians are the best element and the most law-abiding citizens of Detroit." Such occasions occur often and the daily *America* devotes a great deal of publicity to these official contacts, which enhance the prestige of the Roumanians and help them to penetrate gradually into the broader life of the American community.

Besides the contacts established by private or group initiative on the part of the Roumanians, new connections are made by the intervention of certain American institutions, such as settlements and community centers. These organizations, however, have affected relatively little the Roumanians, either because the area of influence was limited or because the Roumanians did not endeavor to make use of such agencies in their neighborhood. In Chicago, Christopher House, in the vicinity of the Clybourn-Fullerton district, had come in touch with only 11 mothers, who leave their babies there while they go to work, and with 21 children. The Commons, Hull House and North Western University Settlement were in districts too distant from the Roumanians. The Immigrant's Protective League, though far away from all the Roumanian neighborhoods, has carried a load of one hundred cases over a period of three years, 1926-1928 inclusive.[3] In

[1] See *America*, no. 210, Sept. 7, 1927.

[2] See *America*, no. 246, Oct. 19, 1927.

[3] From the *Annual Reports of the Immigrants' Protective League*, 1926, 1927, 1928.

other cities, social agencies and community centers have made even fewer contacts with the Roumanians, perhaps because the latter did not attract attention by their numbers or because they were self-supporting and independent enough to seek the advice of expert leadership. Even in Detroit, where there are approximately 30,000 Roumanians and their number might have attracted the attention of the social agencies, there is no social settlement especially interested in the socialization and Americanization of the Roumanian colony. However, a few organizations, such as the International Institute of the Y. W. C. A., the Y. M. C. A. and different clubs, have endeavored from time to time to bring the Roumanians and other nationalities together—this not only in Detroit but in other cities as well. All festive occasions are utilized for the commingling of the different ethnic groups. Sometimes it is a Mardi Gras parade of the Al Sirat Grotto Fraternity [1] in Cleveland, which brings the Roumanians together with other national groups, while at other times it is a banquet given by the King's Daughters' Class of Central Christian Church,[2] which gives opportunity to the Roumanian women of Cleveland to know their American sisters. In New York City the Cosmopolitan Concert and Nations' Festival [3] has enabled the Roumanians to give a demonstration to the great American public of their artistic contribution to the making of American culture. By such means they themselves learn what other ethnic groups have brought to this country in the way of cultural heritage. Cleveland is most active in developing inter-group and inter-racial contacts. There the International Institute, the public library and the public schools are endeavoring to help the immigrant break, with less friction, the "cake of custom." The Cleveland press, through

[1] See *America*, no. 152, 1927.

[2] See *America*, no. 60, March 12, 1927.

[3] See *America*, no. 276, Nov. 25, 1927.

its Nations' Dance,[1] brought the Romanians in close touch with other ethnic groups of the city by enabling them to exhibit their national costumes and folk dancing.

But it would be erroneous to believe that these casual connections, established by the initiative of private agencies, can affect deeply the total number of persons in each colony of Roumanians, for only a very small number of adults come in touch with these organizations. The majority of contacts are established by the individual immigrant in his occupational, economic or recreational life. It is through this personal and direct give-and-take between the Roumanian immigrant and his environment that the Roumanian colonies partake of the group life of the American community, and thereby are affected little by little in their social behavior and mental reactions. The process of infiltration of American civilization and culture into the life of the Roumanian groups is slow and sometimes retarded by their strong nationalistic organizations. On the other hand, the latter are a means whereby the Roumanian immigrants through their own efforts succeed in reaching the ideals and standards of living of the Americans.

Consequently the clinging to original or ethnic tradition does not necessarily signify an anti-American segregation, when it leaves enough freedom to the immigrants as individuals to establish daily contacts with the larger American community.

After the first strangeness has worn off, the newcomers feel a natural desire to become an integral part of the new life in which they find themselves. This, like most social changes, takes a long time to achieve and seems to follow a general process of evolution through the old familiar forms and customs. It is not peculiar to this situation but appears to be a phenomenon of all lasting and satisfactory social change.

[1] See *America*, no. 250, Oct. 24, 1927.

CHAPTER VIII

The Old Culture and the New Environment

It is beyond the scope of this book to discuss the effect of migration from the standpoint of the "catastrophic theory of civilization"[1] which considers civilization as a "consequence of contact and communication" and endeavors to correlate "every advance in culture with a new period of wandering."[2] Neither does this study deal primarily with the importance of migration as an agency of progress,[3] nor follow the biological changes brought about by the mingling of peoples or the influence of climate. The main objective is to follow the migration of Roumanians in its larger effects, that is, to trace the changes in mores and customs, the resistance, modification or elimination of the immigrant's traits which are not in harmony with the new environment, and the adoption of new habits and new points of view. These changes do not occur directly as between two cultures, the old and the new, but as between individual immigrants and their environment.

The Roumanians under the pressure of the new culture had greatly to modify their tradition and beliefs in order not to clash with the spirit of the American community. Their social heritage, though of great importance to them, because it had controlled all their past behavior, was not likewise in

[1] Park, R. E., "Human Migration and the Marginal Man," *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. xxxiii, May, 1928, p. 882.

[2] *Ibid.*; also Carl Bücher, *Industrial Revolution*, p. 347.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 883.

total harmony with the new environment. In the process of modification it is obvious that behavior patterns would change more easily and more rapidly than traditions and beliefs, for the former react upon the community at large and encounter its approval or disapproval, while the latter being of a subjective nature escape such social control.

First in order came changes in costume. The Roumanians realized that their attire was arousing the curiosity, and sometimes even the scorn, of people in the streets, because it helped to sort them out as "greenhorns". They also found it inconvenient to wear white in the dingy surroundings of the workshops. Consequently, yielding to the power of imitation, they adopted the more sober and inconspicuous American fashion of dress, both for practical reasons and for the stamping out of the social stigma of being "an alien". This change took place without difficulty, because in a democratic community, which believes in the sacredness of the individual, no social pressure is exercised by one class in order to control the fashions of another on the ground of economic and cultural superiority. At present in the Roumanian colonies visited only a few aged women still cling to the old-country idea that "one cannot dress like a lady or a gentleman unless born in the middle class or the aristocracy." They may be seen going about with full black skirts coming down to the ankles, tight dark bodices coming as low as the hips and black kerchiefs tied under their chin.[1] All the others, men, women and children, have adopted American clothes, which in their uniformity, or conformity to fashion, have wiped away class and racial differences indicated by the native costume. Only on rare occasions do they wear the national costume, but when they do they take a great

[1] This type of costume is worn by the peasant women in Transylvania. It is very sober and mournful and differs from the richly colored Roumanian national costume of other districts.

deal of pride in it. They no longer fear social scorn, because Americans, since the armistice, have changed their attitude toward the display of national costumes by immigrants, partly from appreciation of the curious and beautiful handwork and to some extent by a realization that the cultural heritage of ethnic groups must be preserved for the benefit of American culture. For this reason, whenever organizations like the International Institute of the Y. W. C. A., settlements or community centers ask the collaboration of the Roumanians in pageants or artistic programs, the Roumanians are always ready to appear in their native costume. In every-day life, however, they wear American clothes, which they appreciate for the feeling of equality that they give. But occasionally one does meet old folks who regret the disappearance of the national costume from every-day life. So one old man in Chicago said:

I do not recognize my countrymen. They look just like others and unless I hear them talk our language, I think they are Poles or Serbs or Irish. The men have even clipped their moustaches, the sign of virile manhood. But such is the fashion here. With their smooth faces men look like women, just as the women with their bobbed hair try to look boyish. It is the world upside down. I cannot understand how they are able to do these things and still claim that they are Roumanians.

But such regrets are few and far from upsetting the immigrant to the point of causing maladjustment.

More serious are the psychological conflicts which arise from the breaking down of customs with a deeper emotional content. The following story well illustrates the feeling of many of the older generation, in the face of economic pressure.

Nowadays everything goes fast [sighed an old woman]. Chris-

tenings are done within a twinkle of the eye. The priests are rushing so much in saying their prayers that I fear the evil spirit does not have the time to depart from the child, before the sacrament of the Holy Spirit takes place.

The wedding festivities are shortened to one day. Who can afford to be merry for three days! The factory closes its doors to you if you are late 15 minutes. But what about being absent two or three days? You might just as well give up your job. Besides, why have the forewoman or the foreman think you are the worst *of them all.* You know how it is. I do not like to have my name as a Roumanian discredited. I have been 12 years at the same factory and each time I brought another Roumanian they took her in. We are 15 of us there now and they like us. But we do not lay off for three days for the sake of wedding ceremonies!

Under the pressure of time and of the necessity of keeping up with American standards many of the religious observances are breaking down. Mr. F. in Akron, O., said:

Saints' days! They are all the same for the people here. The factories are closed on Labor Day but we must work on St. Georges' Day, on the Holy Assumption and on St. Elias' Day, to speak nothing of all the other Fêtes. Wouldn't the lightning strike us if we dared do that in our Country? There we all used to go to church, but here we go to the factory instead. However I never neglect to light my oil lamp before the holy icons. In this way my conscience is at ease with the Saints. Sometimes I think I am getting to be a heathen. But then I see so many churches here and so many different ways of being a Christian that I say: well! those people who have more learning than myself must know better, when they work on Saints' days instead of going to church.

In other instances old customs and superstitions have to be modified in order to comply with the established ways of the

new environment. Said Mrs. S., one of the first immigrants:

I cannot get accustomed to the idea of having the dead carried away in an automobile. Think of their poor souls jolted by the jerks of the speedy hearse! There is no time to mourn for them or to convey them slowly to their last abode. Everything is done in such a hurry! They are shut up in their biers as if they had contagious diseases. Such are the orders of the Board of Health. How can one be sure that life has really passed away and that the person is not deeply asleep?

For my part, when I see the closed coffin I fear, lest relatives or friends having forgotten to put in his hand the coin to pay his passage to St. Peter, the dead may be refused entrance to Paradise! When we first came, 22 years ago, we had often a band at the funeral, specially if the dead were young people, taken away in the prime of life. But nowadays this is out of fashion, because the Americans do not have such things. The young are afraid of being ridiculed by their neighbours. They want to follow "real American style" as they say here. So our dead are conveyed to their graves without music.

But while some religious customs of a superstitious character break down, others survive. Thus at Christmas, the carol singers or "Colindatorii" go, as in the Old Country villages, from house to house singing the "Good morning, old Christmas Eve," "The Eastern Star is rising high above," or the "Three Wise Men from the East." They collect money either for the church or for some fraternal organization. Cleveland and Youngstown[1] have had their "Colindatorii" from among the adult people, while in other colonies carol singing is left to children, who enjoy the opportunity of gathering some coins.

The marriage ceremonies and festivities are shortened,

[1] *America*, no. 300, Dec., 1927.

but the preliminary arrangements for marriage and the ceremonials take place in the customary way. So the mother of one young bride said: "Here people marry with no preliminary preparations. But we like to provide for the future of our children, and so we still go on giving a dowry to our daughters.. It gives the young a better start in housekeeping, without preventing love marriages from taking place."

Due to the old custom of sharing recreation with all the members of the family, the parents have the opportunity to notice the friendships that their children are forming and to direct, to some extent, their final choice when it comes to marriage.

> Our children certainly make their choice [said the father of the bridegroom]. But we keep an alert eye upon them when it comes to marriage. However we strictly keep to the folkways of our native land.

It is the custom for the groom's parents to call on the girl's family. No intimate friends or relatives are allowed to profane the secrecy of this visit, for if the outcome is negative, the young man's parents may retire, giving an alleged motive, so that gossip may be avoided. Sometimes the refusal is only temporary, as many parents do not like to give the impression that they are anxious to see their daughter marry. A final answer is withheld and visits continue between the parents of the two parties, until the girl's parents can proudly say: "Well, we were so pressed that we had to give our consent." Once the official demand is over, then comes the "Tocmeala". It is an old custom, that gathers the friends and elders of the community around the table of the girl's parents, in order to decide about the price at which the "Socrii Mari" (groom's parents) will have to "buy the bride". The custom requires that the groom provide the nuptial attire of the bride, so his parents

have to demonstrate his generosity. Sometimes the bride receives only $20 and sometimes $100. The money is used partly to defray the cost of the presents the bride makes to the members of her new family and to the godparents, who are the religious sponsors of the wedding. It is during the "Tocmeala" that the young man's parents present the traditional "colac", a kind of bread in the form of a crown, as the sign of accepted kinship. The bride breaks it above the head of her best friend, the superstition being that the latter will also marry in the course of the year. When the "Tocmeala" is over then comes the bride's and groom's party, usually held in a big hall, where all the young people in the neighborhood dance and frolic until dawn.

On the Saturday preceding the wedding celebration, the "Lada" (the hope-chest), containing the girl's personal wardrobe and household supplies, is transported with special ceremony to the "future conjugal nest". This offers another opportunity for dancing. But the great event is the religious celebration, when the procession enters the church in all the splendor and decorum which surround such occasions.

At the end of the religious ceremony and the congratulations received in the church, a party follows, either in the house of the groom's parents or preferably in the church hall. There the godmother performs the duty of "placing on the bride's head the 'marama'" (head dress used only by the married women), while the guests sing the doleful "song of the passing maidenhood". This is always a sad ceremony and many cry. But then follow mirth and the "sale by auction" of a dance with the bride at the price of a kiss or a forfeit. There is rivalry in bidding and the money so gathered is presented to the bride and the groom.

The fete ends with the "Hora Mare" (a national dance in circles) and the "cushion game", which lasts until sun-

rise. Everybody, young and old, dances the "Hora". In the center of the circle a young man stands, holding a cushion in his hand. As soon as he discovers a pretty girl he runs to kneel in front of her and she must kiss him. Then the girl takes his place, and so the game goes on.

In the native village a masquerade party drove about and played all kinds of tricks on the young married people, their parents or godparents, during the day following the wedding. But in the city and throughout the new country this custom has been dropped.

Marriage in Roumania has two aspects: the legal, which requires a civil ceremony performed by the mayor or the "Ofiterul starei civile" (a special official in the city hall), and the religious consecration by the priest, which is important chiefly from the standpoint of tradition and custom. In the United States, however, the officiatory Roumanian priest performs the ceremony, which is both civil and religious, as is the custom of the country, for in accordance with article 152 of the "Codul Civil" (the civil code) of 1924 the marriages of Roumanians, outside Roumania, are recognized as legal when performed according to the customs prevailing in the foreign country where these Roumanians live.

In general, Roumanians have a great respect for the institution of marriage and a hostile attitude towards divorce. They are shocked by the great number of divorce cases in the United States among the population at large.

A mother anxious about the future of her daughter said:

I am very careful about the young people my daughter meets. I think that unless parents are attentive many a misfortune may fall upon their children. Here everyone marries and becomes divorced at will. A man sees a girl once, he marries her the next day in order to divorce her the following. People here change their wives as they renew their linen.

But marriage is not a patch to be pieced or ripped off at

will. It is a serious engagement for life and our children must realize it.

Comments such as this are common and expressive of the general attitude of the first generation of Roumanians towards the question of divorce. " He is good for nothing, he is a divorced man," is a statement often met with. The same thing holds true for a woman. This attitude explains why the family continues to be the social unit which commands the respect of Roumanians, while bachelors, spinsters and divorced people are held in disrepute by the majority.

A survival of a less subjective character and of an æsthetic value is that of folk-dancing. At every *fête* or theatrical performance the " Banul Maracinei " and the " Calușerii " figure on the program, danced by boys and girls in national costume. Even in their regular recreational gatherings, folk-dancing appears side by side with the fox-trot or the shimmy. But the soft music of the gypsy violins or the melodies of the old village fiddlers have been superseded by the metallic tunes of the saxophone and the jazz-band. Often the old pastorals and the national songs are adapted to the cadence of the one-step or two-step. Usually these fêtes and other social gatherings take place on Sunday, for, unlike the Puritans, the Roumanians have no taboos regarding Sabbath observance. Sunday morning is consecrated to the strictly religious observance but the afternoon is given over to merriment.

Despite the drudgery of the factory and the continuous drive of American life, the Roumanians have preserved a keen appreciation for music.[1] The men often gather, during

[1] They have, however, only a single society for the promotion and the teaching of their folksongs. It is the "Doina" (see *America*, no. 128, Aug., 1927) a glee club in Cleveland which is similar to the choral societies of Banat, the province which occupies a foremost place in musical achievements and has contributed musicians such as Ion Vidu, Tiberiu Brediceanu, whose collections of Roumanian folksongs are well

the evening, in a billiard room, a restaurant or a hall to strike up a folksong. More often they like to hear it sung by the young people, unless they have victrola records of folksongs and folkdances by the best Roumanian artists.

Perhaps the most striking survival among the old customs of the Roumanians is their hospitality. Whether one calls on them on business or for pleasure, he is always presented with some eatables: a teaspoonful of jam or fruit preserves with a glass of cold water, a glass of home-made beer or wine, a cup of coffee or a piece of cake. If the call happens to be near a meal hour, one can hardly escape from sharing their dinner or supper without giving offence to those who offer such spontaneous and whole-hearted hospitality. Of course every generalization has its exceptions, and there are some Roumanians who have become suspicious of the caller who intrudes into the privacy of their homes on the excuse of gathering data. But in general, the old customs of hospitality have been well preserved.

The slow modification of the old cultural traits of the Roumanians is not the result merely of juxtaposition of the two cultures. It depends a great deal on the adaptability of these immigrants and their ability to modify their former behavior in order to make it more harmonious with the new environment. Each time the Roumanian immigrant has been successful in eradicating or modifying an old custom which clashed with the new culture, an adjustment has resulted. Thus, in modifying religious observances in order to meet the industrial demands of the community, in preserving traditions which may survive without becoming obnoxious to the other members of the larger neighborhood, in adopting American standards of living, in sharing in the prob-

known (see *America*, no. 229, 29 Sept., 1927), and Sabin Dragoi, from Temisoara, whose recent opera "Napasta" is being translated into Italian. The village of Saliste, in the district of Sibiu, is also known for its musical interpretation and appreciation of the peasant folksongs.

lems and crises of American life, in abiding by the laws of this country, in securing an economic independence, in relying upon their own forces for mutual help, in learning the English language, the Roumanians have given ample proof of their ability to adjust to the complex American life.

Another way of gauging the degree of assimilation is to consider to what extent the process of naturalization is under way. It is quite obvious that the declaration to become a citizen, motivated by either utilitarian or sentimental reasons, does manifest the desire of the immigrant to identify himself with the American community. Thus in 1920, 42.2% of the Roumanians over 21 years of age [1] had already become American citizens, 13.3% have taken their first papers, 40.6% remained aliens and 3.9% did not report data. Measured statistically, the process of naturalization shows that more than half of the Roumanians are consciously endeavoring to identify themselves with American life.

Another way in which the Roumanians have shown cultural assimilation is through their participation in the great events which affected every member of the American community during the World War, the Red Cross drives, and the Liberty Loan campaigns. Their contribution to the American army was rather small. Sporadic enrolments came from all the colonies everywhere, but in Youngstown 146 Romanian volunteers organized a military unit under the name of "the Legion of the Roumanian Volunteers of Youngstown, Ohio," [2] which soon embarked for France, where its members paid blood tribute to their country of adoption.[3] The Roumanian contribution to the American

[1] See *U. S. Census*, 1920, vol. ii, p. 834. Total number of Roumanians over 21 years of age was 91,117, including the Roumanian Jews as well.

[2] See *Romanul*, no. 9, year xxv, 6 March, 1927.

[3] Fighting for the great cause meant incidentally the liberation of Transylvania from Austria-Hungary.

Red Cross amounted to $100,000,[1] most of which was sent to relieve the suffering in Roumania. As to the share in the Liberty Loan, it reached 5.3 of the total amount of the bonds taken, though the Romanians represented only 0.2% of the total foreign-born population. They even ranked above the Swedes, who, though representing 4.5% of the total foreign-born population, have contributed only 4.1% of the Loan.[2]

But while the majority are adapting themselves to the American life, because they are able to accept the change without any lasting conflict, there are some who have not succeeded in making the necessary adjustment to their environment, because of their inability or unwillingness to modify their mores. The maladjusted Roumanians may be roughly classified as:

(1) those who find it impossible to control their emotional reactions because of the noise of the factory and the more minute division of labor which renders work monotonous and destroys their natural joviality;
(2) those who long for the fresh air and green pastures of their villages, yet pass by the parks, not noticing the green turf or the rich foliage;
(3) those who fear or ridicule the mechanical innovations of the "new civilization", e. g., prefer to ride in street-cars rather than use the subway;
(4) those who do not succeed in learning the English language and for whom the new environment remains always an enigma;
(5) those who ignore new laws and customs, either because they adhere to their own traditions and super-

[1] See Drutzu, S., *op. cit.*, p. 231.

[2] See Bierstadt, E. N., *Aspects of Americanization* Cincinnati, Stewart Kidd & Co., 1922, p. 237.

stitions, or because their ignorance prevents them from realizing the value of labor and health legislation;

(6) those who never succeed in making a proper economic adjustment for the support of their families and are dependent upon the community for help;[1]

(7) those who are forced to return home because they cannot keep up with the speed and efficiency of American life;

(8) those who have offended the American community through their anti-social behavior and have encountered its disapproval.[2]

[1] This group varies from the individual whose inadequate income must be supplemented by out-door relief, concerning whom neither data nor information are available, to those totally dependent on public charity for their support, from the unscrupulous father who deserts his family, to the painstaking bread-winner who meets with accident or disaster. The Census Bureau reports that there were sixty Roumanians admitted as paupers in almshouses during 1922 from a total of 62,336 foreign-born Roumanians. On January 1, 1923, the number of Roumanians considered as paupers was thirty, which represents 0.1% of the total number of paupers. Their distribution per 100,000 population was 48.1 ranking above that of the Greeks which was 37.2; of the Spanish, 43.7 and of the Italians, 45.7, but being far below that of the German, Dutch and Flemish group, which was 137.9 per 100,000, that of the Swedes, Norwegians and Danes, which was 162.4; and that of the English and Celtic, which was 343.0 per 100,000 (see *Bureau of Census*, Department of Commerce, "Paupers in Almshouses, 1923," Washington, 1925, pp. 24, 25). However almshouse pauperism is not a measure of poverty, as there are recipients of outdoor relief, and inmates of other institutions who are not included in those figures. The number of deserted or dependent Roumanian families has been impossible to ascertain.

[2] It is regrettable that the study on the "Number of Prisoners in Penal Institutions 1922 and 1917" of the Bureau of Census, in 1923, has no racial classification of the prisoners in Federal, State, County or Municipal jails and workhouses and that it is impossible to find the ratio of criminality among the Roumanians. Neither has it been possible to measure statistically the delinquency among the second generation. From

The new environment has been instrumental in bringing about in the Roumanian immigrant changes in habits and in attitudes of mind, changes imposed on one hand by American civilization and on the other by American culture, inspired by democratic ideals. The every-day mechanical appliances of either the home or the factory, the rapid means of communication by train, automobile, fast steamer or airplane, the transmission of the voice through the telephone and the radio, all these inventions which, in Europe, are still enjoyed by the few but are within the reach of everyone in the United States, have helped the Roumanians to get rid of a number of superstitious beliefs and practices. They have learned a more experimental attitude towards things unknown, and to abandon belief in the interference of some transcendent power. They may still wonder about the why and the how of the telephone or of electricity, but they are not afraid of them as proof of the existence of an evil spirit, and accept them as a matter of course, and as inventions of men. Their attitude towards things which are difficult to apprehend has evolved from fear, suspicion and wonder to a pragmatism based upon the assurance that man's creative ability and potential qualities are inexhaustible. Said a clever writer in New York City:

Had they told me, in the Old Country, that one could travel under ground and under water, that bridges could be suspended in the air, that one could speak from his house to a friend dis-

verbal statements made by Police and Juvenile Court authorities, corroborated in each of the seventeen localities where Roumanians were visited, it seems that both criminality and delinquency are so low among these immigrants, that they are insignificant. However, judged from the figures and data collected in Chicago (see chapter xii, appendix), the situation seems more realistic and less optimistic, as the Roumanians have shown definite signs of criminality and delinquency, though not in such great numbers as to be considered a threat to the social order of American life.

tant 100 miles, that one need not kindle a fire to heat the house, I should have declared that such things were untrue or the workings of the Devil. But here I see that all those things are possible, because men have set out to do them. "Try it" is the crying motto of life and it is through that spirit of unremitting experiment that so many inventions are possible.

Most powerful in transforming their character has been the application in every-day life of the principle of democracy based upon belief in the sacredness of the individual and self-determination.[1] In the relationship between employer and employee, in the street-cars, in daily dealings with tradesmen and shopkeepers, everywhere the Roumanian immigrants have seen that in this country the individual is treated with respect and consideration. In the Roumanian communities in the United States there are fewer class distinctions which favor some at the expense of the many; and there are so many more possibilities for the Roumanian immigrant to improve his condition and to rise from one economic status to another that this has had an appreciable effect. As an illustration the following cases are to the point:

Case I.

Mr. A. originally from the Old Kingdom of Roumania and at present living in Indianapolis, came to America at the age of 16 (in 1903). He worked first in the steel industry in Youngstown then in the coal mining industry. In 1906 he became a day laborer with a builder. He went to night school while he was engaged at the Kinggan & Co. slaughtering house. Later he went from the Commercial School to the Benjamin Harrison Law School, and has become a prominent lawyer. His activities throughout the war period, with both the Roumanian colony and the American community, have made him one of

[1] See Drachsler, I., *Theories of Americanization*, 1920, p. 27.

the noted citizens of Indianapolis and an outstanding personality among the Roumanians.[1]

Case II.

M. B. from Fagaras, living at present in Chicago, is finishing his interneship at one of the great hospitals of that city, after taking his M. D. from the University of Chicago. He came to the United States in 1913 at the age of sixteen. He worked as a day laborer in a factory, went to night school and after the sudden death of his parents he worked his way through College as a dish washer, a janitor and as a waiter.

Case III.

Mr. C. from Sibiu, now living in Cleveland came to the United States in 1910, at the age of 13, with his only relative, an uncle, who soon died in Indianapolis and left the young immigrant boy totally without support. His adolescence has been a time of trial. He worked in a stockyard in Indianapolis, on railroads and in the steel industry, always managing to attend school, either working at night and studying during the day time, or working in the day time and studying nights. After graduation from high school he worked his way through college, by tutoring others less endowed mentally. He has become a professor of Latin and is at present working for his Ph.D. in philosophy. His interest in the social organization of the Roumanians, has grown parallel with his intellectual development. The integrity of his character, together with his executive ability, his vision, and his magnetic personality have made him one of the most efficient leaders of the Roumanian colonies.

Case IV.

Mr. D. living at present in Akron Ohio, came to the United States in 1905, when he was 19 years old. Originally from Fagarash, in Transylvania, where his parents were farm laborers, he migrated first to the Old Kingdom of Roumania, served

[1] See *Calendarul National America*, 1929, p. 87.

as a clerk in a grocery store from his thirteenth to his seventeenth year in Muscel, became the shipping clerk of a literary magazine in Bucarest for a period of two years, then came to Detroit, where he worked in the Ford factory from 1905-1909. At that time he entered business, had a billiard room and a grocery store in 1912, adding a saloon restaurant in 1915, and still later a steamship agency and a bank. Meanwhile he became the correspondent of the Bank of Europe from New York, then assistant in the foreign department of the Park National Bank of Newark, Ohio. He acted as president of the National Committee of the Roumanian Red Cross in the United States for three years, and finally settled in Akron. He went on a short visit to the Old Country, in 1912, to marry one of his compatriots. Now he has a family of 6 children. He has had affiliations with the Roumanian fraternal organizations for 20 years, is a member of the society " Free Roumania " in Akron, and has been on several occasions appointed president, cashier, trustee, etc. of the Union of the Beneficial and Cultural Roumanian societies.[1]

All four of these persons have become American citizens. But of course these are illustrations of the few cases of rare individuals who have rapidly climbed the social ladder through their own perseverance, without being hampered by social conventions, class divisions and prejudices. The majority of Roumanians have evolved in a less spectacular way.

Living mostly in the North Central States, where the racial problem is not so great as in other parts of the country, they feel that they can better their economic situation and improve their social life without being hampered by political or social shackles, by class antagonism, by racial animosities and jealousies, or by unjust treatment on the part of the authorities. Have they not seen themselves pass from the stage of simple unskilled laborers, with limited means of

[1] See *Calendarul National America*, 1927, p. 133.

subsistence and an uncouth appearance, to that of self-respecting workers enjoying the comforts of American civilization and driving their own cars to the factory? Even peasant women, who in the Old Country had no political nor social rights, have here a fair chance to improve their situation. Sharing with their husbands the responsibility of the support of the family and participating in the struggle of life, they have secured a better position in the new community. They have been allowed to become active members in the Beneficial and Cultural Societies, and to assume responsibility in the affairs of their ethnic group, despite the Old Country's idea that a woman's place is in the home. They have developed their own women's associations, which are increasing in number since 1925, most of them being directly connected with the Church.[1] Even the children enjoy the freedom of expression [2] taught in the American schools, and

[1] The chief women's organizations which have used the daily *America* to announce their meetings or fêtes are: "the Roumanian Greek-Orthodox Women's Association"; "St. Helen's Roumanian Greek-Catholic Women's Association", and "St. Mary's Roumanian Greek-Catholic Women's Association" in Cleveland, Ohio; "the Roumanian Greek-Catholic Women's Association, St. Mary" in Canton, Ohio; "the Roumanian Women's Association, Faith," in Chicago; "the Roumanian Women's Association, Queen Mary," in Detroit; "the Roumanian Women's Association," in Gary, Indiana; "the Roumanian Women's Association, Princess Helen," in Indiana Harbor, Ind.; "the Roumanian Women's Association," in Sharon, Ohio and "the Roumanian Greek-Catholic Women's Association 'Pietatea'," in Youngstown, Ohio.

[2] The young people have organized their own clubs with a view to learning to appreciate their cultural heritage, and to developing leadership to carry on the Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies. The most important Clubs are the "Roumanian Youth" in Alliance, Ohio; the "Educational Club of Roumanian Youth" and "Doina" in Cleveland, Ohio; the "Roumanian Youth" in Detroit; the "Roumanian Youth" in Farrell, Pennsylvania; the "Roumanian Progress" in Indianapolis, Ind.; the "Roumanian Youth" in Massillon, Ohio; the "Cultural and Educational Club, Alba Iulia" in Salem, Ohio, and the Club "Mihail Eminescu" in New York City.

the parents must modify the discipline of the home, whether they wish to or not.

As to social contacts with other ethnic groups of the American community, they are permeated with the same feeling of liberalism, brotherhood and respect for neighbors' rights which are characteristic of Americans. Up to 1923 the fraternal organizations were exclusively for Roumanians.[1] But recently a more liberal attitude has been adopted. These societies are entitled to have "passive members of any nationality and in unlimited numbers, paying monthly dues and receiving in exchange the corresponding benefits." [2]

The sense of individual worth growing out of factory and school contacts has given Roumanians the courage to express openly their opinion. Breaking away from their former servile attitude before any authoritative power, they have dared to criticize or disapprove policies that they consider erroneous, remaining, however, law-abiding. For example, they have protested against the action taken by Mr. Octavian Goga, Minister of Interior under the Liberal régime, in suspending in Roumania the circulation of the daily *America* on the ground that it openly attacked the government. At a meeting of protest called in Youngstown, Feb. 27, 1927,[3] the representatives of 22 Roumanian colonies sent telegrams to the Roumanian Minister of Interior and to three representatives [4] of the House of Deputies, ask-

[1] Article XX of the Constitution of the Union of Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies in America (U. S. R. A.)—as it stood in 1923—required that: "The members of the branches of this organization shall be Roumanians who speak and understand the Roumanian language, shall be of all creeds, except Jewish and Mohamedan". (See *Constitution and By-Laws of the U. S. R. A.*, 1923, p. 39.)

[2] See *America*, no. 270, year xxiii, 15 Nov., 1928.

[3] See *America*, no. 49, Feb. 27, 1927.

[4] Messrs. Voicu Nitsescu, Prof. N. Iorga and Dr. N. Lupu, all three in sympathy with the Peasant Party in Transylvania. See *America*, no. 50, March 1, 1927.

ing them to insist upon the withdrawal of the Ministerial decision which curtailed the freedom of the press.[1]

On another occasion when, in the spring of 1928, Dr. I. Maniu,[2] the leader of the Peasant Party, had called a meeting at Alba-Iulia to protest against the Liberal Government and to ask for an administration based on justice, efficiency and economic readjustment, the Roumanians in the United States, in sympathy with the democratic principles of the Peasant Party, opened a subscription list to help that party carry on its campaign.[3]

But even in America they have appealed to the local authorities with the same daring. When the Hungarians in Pittsburgh carried on a series of protest meetings against the Roumanian Agrarian Reform, as affecting the Magyars in Transylvania, a committee of the Roumanian leaders from the vicinity of Pittsburgh addressed a petition to the mayor of the city asking him to prevent such propaganda gatherings, which were prone to embitter the relationships of the citizens of Pittsburgh and to disturb the peace of the city.[4] The same attitude of sane criticism is observed in their personal relationships and in the activities of their societies. While in the Old Country any public attack would have been considered the cause of a feud, here it is accepted as a part of the game.

At the annual convention of the Union of the Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies, held in Cleveland, June 9, 10, 11, 1927, every representative expressed openly his criti-

[1] The freedom of press was guaranteed by the Constitution of 1866, and reguaranteed by Article 25, of the Law of March 28, 1923, see *Romanul,* no. 10, year xxv, March 13, 1927.

[2] Dr. I. Maniu is the present Prime Minister of Roumania; he was asked by the Regency on Nov. 5, 1928 to form the Cabinet (see *America,* no. 261 and 262, Nov. 5, 6, 1928).

[3] See *America,* nos. 117, 126, May 17, 28, 1928.

[4] See *America,* no. 94, April 20, 1928.

cism or appreciation of the administration of the Executive Committee. Some of the attacks were so bitter and so personal that the presiding officer had to interrupt the speakers from the floor; however, when the meeting was over the same people who attacked the President and the other members of the Executive Committee, shook hands with them as if nothing had occurred.[1]

In summing up the effects of the new environment upon the old culture it is worth noting that constant interaction between the two has produced changes, which have modified the immigrant's cultural traits and have produced among the Roumanians a new attitude of mind, a new appreciation of their real selves. Every immigrant who had severed his home ties had also broken to some extent "the cake of custom" and left himself open to the influence of the new civilization and culture. Within him started the struggle for predominance between the old custom, which up to that time had regulated and controlled his life, and the new patterns of behavior, determined by the new conception of life. As a consequence of this competition a process of infiltration has resulted. The old culture has receded until it has been gradually superseded by the new civilization and culture, not however without making its contribution to them. Those traits have survived which can co-exist with the new culture without causing maladjustment of the individual immigrant, while others, condemned by the opinion of the whole community, have been either wiped out or so modified as to fit the environment. The immigrant in whom the conflict of the two cultures takes place is either accepting the substitution of the new cultural traits for the old without a great deal of resistance and expenditure of effort or is rejecting them by clinging strongly to his old patterns of behavior. In the former case he adopts the prevailing customs of his environ-

[1] From personal observation at the Convention in Cleveland in 1927.

ment and becomes adjusted to it. In the latter he is overcome by them, loses his self-determination and emotional control, and grows in complete disharmony with his environment.

If we were to apply the law of social evolution and natural selection to the transplanted immigrants, it would have to be worded as follows:

> Those immigrants survive who are not necessarily the strongest physically nor intellectually, but who are willing and able to modify their cultural heritage and to adopt the new patterns of behavior which favor adjustment to the new environment.

CHAPTER IX

The Principle of Assimilation

THE PROCESS OF ASSIMILATION: ECONOMIC, CULTURAL, ETHNIC

The restrictive immigration measures resorted to by the American Government in response to public opinion, have been of a selective nature, barring first the physically and mentally handicapped and the illiterate; then in the post-war period, limiting the number of immigrants from southeastern European countries as being less easily assimilated than those of northern and western Europe. This restriction was based on current theories regarding the lowering of working-class standards and wages by the influx of unskilled workers, the superiority of the Nordic race, the impairment of the cultural heritage of the founders of the nation.

Whatever the validity of the alleged reasons for these measures,[1] it stands to reason that any immigrant group faces the difficult problem of conforming to the general standards commonly accepted by the American community, by gradually eliminating traits which clash with the new environment. This modification of the immigrant's characteristics has been variously referred to as: social adaptation, adjustment, or Americanization. Perhaps the best current terminology is "assimilation".

Professor Fairchild defines it as the "act or process of assimilation, or bringing to a resemblance, conformity or identity."[2] "The process by which a nationality preserves

[1] Fairchild, H. P., *The Melting-Pot Mistake*, Boston, 1926, pp. 251-253.

[2] Fairchild, H. P., *Immigration*, New York, 1923 edition, p. 398.

its unity while admitting representatives of outside nationalities, . . . a process of transformation, the changing of the heterogeneous into the homogeneous, the unlike to the like." [1] Drachsler, more explicit in his interpretation, writes:

> The general public concept of assimilation is that of a process of modification of the characteristics of the immigrant to accord with prevalent American types, psychology, customs and institutions usually by superimposing American manners plus American ideas upon those of the immigrant.[2]

Both these definitions imply the necessity that the United States maintain a national character and recognize the influence of environment in transforming the immigrant and incorporating him into the American body politic.

The question of assimilation has been and is still one of controversy. Ardent advocates of the environmental influence in modifying racial characteristics have advanced two related theories regarding assimilation. The first one, better known as the "Melting-Pot" theory, considers America "as God's crucible, the great Melting-Pot where all the races of Europe are melting and reforming." [3] Lewis, extending Zangwill's idea, has said:

> We believed America was the great caldron where all races would be commingled and out of the fusion would come a new race, stronger, more virile, than any which went into the mixture. A clean, fine, strong superman would be evolved.[4]

This theory is based on the democratic assumption that all ethnic groups, whether numerous or small, have a contribution to make to America and that irrespective of their cul-

[1] Fairchild, H. P., *The Melting-Pot Mistake*, Boston, 1926, pp. 136-137.

[2] Drachsler, J., *Democracy and Assimilation*, New York, 1920, p. 210.

[3] Zangwill, I., *Melting-Pot*, New York, 1910, p. 37.

[4] Lewis, E. R., *America, Nation or Confusion*, New York, 1928, p. 114.

tural differences, the fusion of their racial and cultural strains takes place by the mere fact that they are thrust together in the same "milieu". It considers the immigrant as having consciously accepted America as the embodiment of the ideals of freedom and liberty and as being ready and willing to undergo all the changes necessary for his complete Americanization. It overlooks the time element involved in the process of pruning old traits and of grafting new habits upon the immigrant; and in securing complete de-nationalization and re-nationalization through racial amalgamation. It fails to take into account that in the crucible some strong racial and cultural characteristics of one ethnic group may prevent the conservation of desirable traits in another, or may obliterate them altogether, especially if the first is numerically superior as well.

Similar in its fundamental principle but quite different in the results desired is the "Americanization Theory." It also subscribes to the total modification of the immigrant by the new environment. But instead of letting the fusion of cultural traits take place under the mere play of chance, it would force all modification to conform to a given model, the Anglo-Saxon type. It advocates that all immigrants should obliterate in the shortest time possible their old characteristics and adopt the standards of life and ideals of the Anglo-Saxons.

> The main point [says Berkson] is that all newcomers from far lands must as quickly as possible divest themselves of their old characteristics, and through intermarriage and complete taking over of the language, customs, hopes, aspirations of the American type, obliterate all ethnic distinctions.[1]

The error of this theory lies in the fact that it endorses without reservation the "Nordic Myth" as an unchallenged

[1] Berkson, I. B., *Theories of Americanization*, New York, 1920, p. 55.

scientific truth and claims that the Anglo-Saxon culture is the only one suitable to Americans. Moreover, it supports with equal strength two antagonistic ideas: the cultural influence of the environment upon the immigrant manifested in the subsequent changes of his characteristics, and the integrity of the Anglo-Saxon culture despite the continuing influx of the immigrant stream from the colonial period to the present day. It seems probable that, if the immigrants under environmental pressure divest themselves of their old traits in order to acquire new patterns of behavior, the native-born too, from their contact with immigrants, will also undergo change. If, on the other hand, the perpetuation and preservation of the Anglo-Saxon culture is accepted as an *a priori* fact, there is no reason to deny such preservation to the old culture that the immigrant brings with him.

Many question the advisability of forcing immigrants to divest themselves of their ethnic characteristics and to conform to a standard. "Assimilation, like a steam-roller, ruthlessly crushes the finest flowers of the older civilization, and as a rule only allows to survive an asceticism that is sadly childish and implacably standardized." [1] Others doubt even the possibility of such a standardization: "Standardization is impossible, there is need for an organic differentiation." [2] Enthusiastic advocates of American democratic principles are not lacking, who consider such a standardization or conformity to the Anglo-Saxon standard as thwarting the Jeffersonian principle of constitutional liberty and government. Says Berkson: "The most profound feeling in American tradition is violated, the fundamental intuition upon which American institutions and political organizations are based, namely, a decent respect for the work of person-

[1] Siegfried, A., *America Comes of Age*, New York, 1927, p. 18.

[2] Bridges, H. J., *On Becoming an American*, Boston, 1919, p. 115.

alities which are not altogether like ours and a sincere faith in their potentialities." [1]

Casting aside the environmental influence, the "Federation of Nationalities and the Community" theories, in opposition to the "Melting-Pot and Americanization" theories, stress the force of heredity and the perpetuation of the cultural heritage. The "Federation of Nationalities" theory [2] insists particularly upon the retention of the cultural characteristics of each racial group within the American commonwealth by the preservation of the purity of the race. Mr. H. M. Kallen, who has been the exponent of this theory, says:

> What is inalienable in the life of mankind is its intrinsic positive quality—its psychological inheritance. Men may change their clothes, their politics, their wives, their religions, their philosophies, to a greater or lesser extent: they cannot change their grandfathers.[3]

This theory is based upon the conception that the fullest development of each individual must come along lines of the pattern which has been evolved out of the experience of his racial group, and is handed down by the continuance of the cultural institutions such as the church, the school, the literature, etc. In order to preserve the culture of each racial group within the Union it would be necessary to resort to endogamy and to have every one of them congregate in a political unit with a certain autonomy in regard to religious and educational matters. In other words, the "Federation of Nationalities" theory conceives of a United States of America, similar to the Swiss Republic, where French, Germans and Italians have kept their respective cultural heritage

[1] Berkson, L. B., *op. cit.*, p. 63.

[2] Berkson, I. R., *op. cit.*, pp. 80-81.

[3] Kallen, H. M., *Culture and Democracy in the United States*, New York, 1924, p. 122.

without hampering the national unity of the Swiss Confed-eration, with the sole difference that the official language of the American "democracy of nationalities" would remain English while in Switzerland the three languages are equally recognized as official.[1]

> Each nationality would have for its emotional and involuntary life its own peculiar dialect or speech, its own individual and inevitable esthetic and intellectual forms.[2]

The supporters of this theory see no inherent antagonism between the different racial groups and believe that they could co-exist harmoniously and perpetuate their cultural heritage within the American federation by maintaining the purity of their race.

> The theory is based on the assumption of the ineradicable and central influence of race. That race in the ethnic affiliation is the all important and predestinating fact in the life of the individual.[3]

Or, as Kallen puts it, more emphatically,

> race, in its setting, is at best what individualizes the common heritage, imparting to it presence, personality and force.[4]

According to this theory the American culture would be the sum total of all the cultures existing within the boundaries of the Union.

> American civilization is to be conceived as the unified resultant of the separate cultures existing side by side as distinct entities.[5]

[1] Kallen, H. M., *op. cit.*, p. 122.
[2] Kallen, H. M., *op. cit.*, p. 124.
[3] Berkson, I. B., *op. cit.*, p. 81.
[4] Kallen, H. M., *op. cit.*, p. 180.
[5] Berkson, I. B., *op. cit.*, p. 80.

Or, in the proper words of Mr. Kallen,

> "American civilization" may come to mean the perfection of the cooperative harmonies of "European civilization . . . the waste the squalor and the distress of Europe being eliminated . . . a multiplicity in an unity, an orchestration of mankind." [1]

But such a theory, putting the emphasis upon the preservation of the racial and cultural traits of each group, seems to demand a political and cultural Utopia. The confinement of each ethnic group within a political unit is not possible any longer in the United States with the wide dispersion of these groups. On the other hand, the absolute retention of cultural traits in each group would militate against the development of a national culture, characteristic of America. At best it would create a conglomeration of cultures but not a "unified resultant of the separate cultures." Moreover, such a federation of nationalities without any interaction and reciprocal change is inconceivable because there can be no insurmountable division between non-antagonistic racial groups who are protected by the same political unit, are enjoying the same means of communication and are interested in the same enterprises. There is an interchange and intercommunication of interests and of ideas, which gradually bring the separate cultures into one.

The "Community" theory of assimilation is that which conceives of a partial assimilation of the individual by his environment and of a partial retention of his cultural inheritance. It differs from that of the Federation of Nationalities in that it emphasizes culture instead of race, culture being "the raison d'être of the preservation of the life of the group." [2] Unlike the "Federation of Nationalities" theory, it does not require the segregation of the immigrant group

[1] Kallen, H. M., *op. cit.*, p. 124.

[2] Berkson, I. B., *op. cit.*, pp. 93-102.

nor its consequent local political autonomy. It emphasizes the æsthetic, cultural and religious inheritance rather than racial, and favors the maintenance of the "complementary schools," teaching the mother tongues, as the main agency for safeguarding ethnic cultures. It accepts the co-existence of two allegiances: to the cultural life of the ethnic group and to American life in all its aspects. But from the standpoint of national unity this double allegiance is undesirable. It tends to perpetuate beyond the first generation of immigrants the "marginal man, a cultural hybrid, a man living and sharing intimately in the cultural life and traditions of two distinct peoples . . . . always subject to . . . . spiritual instability, intensified self-consciousness, restlessness and malaise." [1] However, the evils of double allegiance are lessened by the spread of the English language through the public schools. Even with the continuous influx of new immigrants belonging to the same ethnic stocks, the allegiance to two different cultures cannot be perpetuated beyond a certain number of generations, because there is a deep social and economic difference between the newly arrived immigrants and those who have been established in the United States for a longer period and have been modified by the influence of the environment. The ties of a common origin are less strong among them, while the common advance and achievements of either the second or third generation of Americans of diverse origins has a cementing effect.

In order to retain the cultural values of the ethnic groups and to enable them to make a continuous contribution to American culture, Berkson suggests the maintenance of racial purity by avoiding intermarriage, not out of clannishness or racial considerations, but for the mere sake of preserving the cultural heritage of each group. But it is beyond

[1] Park, R. E., "Human Migration and the Marginal Man," *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. xxxiii, May, 1928.

the power of social control to check amalgamation when the general public opinion of the "Community" theory interpret it as the "Building of a Synthetic Civilization that shall bear the imprint of the genius of many peoples," [1] and consider intermarriage a test of assimilation, a means to bring about the merging of different heritages into a unified culture. The "Community" theory itself appears to need a revision based upon a study of the facts concerning intermarriage from any records obtainable. It does not seem possible to reconcile these contradictory views of the question of intermarriage.

These theories are at a disadvantage in that they emphasize the influence either of the environment or that of heredity, without fully taking into consideration the fact that assimilation is not a one-sided process which requires only on the part of the immigrant "the abandonment of one set of mores and the adoption of another," [2] but rather a reciprocal contribution on the part of the "old" and the "new" immigrants to the building-up of an American culture. The principle of assimilation can be stated quite simply. When two peoples of divergent cultures come into contact as a result of immigration, the culture of the alien group is modified by that of the native population. This is most noticeable when the immigrant group consists largely of peasants and laborers seeking to better their condition. This modification is a persistent process in spite of the organized effort on the part of the immigrant to preserve his own traditional culture and mores and to resist the influence of the new culture slowly percolating through the media of education, language and social conditions. This modification is not total but partial, as many cultural traits survive which do not clash with the new environment. The final result, however,

[1] Dracksler, J., *Democracy and Assimilation*, New York, 1920, p. 238.

[2] Fairchild, H. P., *Immigration*, 1923, p. 403.

is the blending of the immigrant traits with the salient characteristics of the native culture, so as to give rise to a new culture, distinctive in character, which is enriched by the contributions of different ethnic stocks. The process of assimilation is very complex. Lapouge describes it in a very graphic way, as a slow "social capillarity" [1] which implies; the modification of some immigrant traits, the retention of the more æsthetic values of the cultural heritage, and the adoption of new habits. It is far from being, as some writers have contended, a process of "denationalization and renationalization," [2] as not all of the national characteristics of the immigrant need disappear. It comprises three stages: economic, cultural, and ethnic assimilation.

The economic or technical assimilation necessitates changes such as races have undergone when they passed from agricultural to industrial occupations, from the status of itinerant day-laborers and unskilled workers to that of stable wage-earners whose quality of work assures permanence of employment. Generally it is an adjustment more common to the first generation [3] because it implies no psychological conflict. It necessitates only the formation of new habits which create satisfaction rather than conflict. It is very important from the standpoint of social economy and social progress because it helps the individual immigrant to raise his standards of living and to secure the means for a better education of his children. However, the chief result of the economic and technical assimilation lies in the

[1] Vacher de Lapouge, G., *Les Selections Sociales*, Paris, 1896, p. 344.

[2] Fairchild, H. P., *Melting Pot Mistake*, Boston, 1926, p. 154.

[3] First generation of immigrants may include parents and their children and perhaps their grand-children. Second generation refers to the native born of foreign parentage. Third generation to the offspring of the native born. This distinction has already been made by Drachsler in his *Intermarriage in New York City*, 1921, p. 16, footnote 3, and also in his *Democracy and Assimilation*, 1920, p. 103, footnote 1.

outward conformity of the immigrant to the general modes of living prevailing in the new environment, since his economic improvement enables him to enjoy comforts which are considered indispensable to the average American worker.

Cultural assimilation calls for adoption by the immigrant of such cultural traits as are characteristic of the new environment and the modification of old customs which are not in harmony with it. It implies mastery of the English language by the immigrant, the embodying in his own life of the principles of American democracy, participation in national experiences which give rise to the same psychological reactions as is the case before a common danger, a common calamity, a common joy. This process is more difficult to achieve because it requires on the part of the immigrant a psychological readjustment which may cause conflict, as it necessitates the elimination of some of the old mores, the formation of new habits, and the retention of part of the old cultural heritage side by side with the more progressive institutions of the new culture. It includes a variety of achievements from the building-up of ethnic organizations, through which the immigrant indirectly becomes familiar with American ideals, to the free utilization of American institutions; from the simple understanding of English to its exclusive use; from mere acquaintance with the American scale of values—moral, social and æsthetic—to their daily application to life. It is obvious that with so many subtle changes involved in cultural assimilation a long period of years is needed for its completion, and consequently the first generation seldom achieves it absolutely.

Ethnic assimilation is secured through intermarriage, either between immigrants of different ethnic stocks or between immigrants and natives. It may ease, when the dif-

ferences arising from maladjusted conjugal conditions are not too striking, the adjustment of parents, and more especially of their children, to the traditions and standards of the new environment. In order to avoid the friction which may arise from the difference in cultural backgrounds, each parent is likely to find in the culture of his country of adoption the common ground for understanding in every-day family relationships and in social contacts with the community. There is no definite place for intermarriage in the immigrant's evolution. Marital contracts are chiefly a personal matter which apparently conform to no fixed law. Sometimes immigrants of the first generation even contract mixed marriages, while members of the third generation may continue to marry people of their own descent. Drachsler has pointed out, however, that there is a tendency among the second generation to intermarry more rapidly than among the first [1] and that the process of assimilation is precipitated through racial amalgamation.

It is quite obvious therefore that, with the foreign-born, intermarriage may either counteract or help assimilation according to the willingness or unwillingness of those concerned to forget their respective backgrounds [which may be sources of conflict], to smooth out their differences and find in American culture a solid ground of understanding. For the native-born of foreign parentage the process of assimilation is more rapid, because the question of their respective origins is of less importance in life than the common experiences which they have had in their American environment through their contacts with the American community and especially through their education in the public schools.

[1] Among persons of the first generation about 11 per 100 seek mates outside of their own group, among those of the second generation the proportion increases to about 32 per 100. See Drachsler, J., *Democracy and Assimilation*, 1920, p. 108.

Beyond the second generation, amalgamation is likely to result in satisfactory assimilation because the eventual clash between the allegiances to two different cultural heritages is entirely offset by the blending effect of two generations of American education. Intermarriage is not a condition *sine qua non* of assimilation, as complete assimilation can be achieved without racial amalgamation. It is more of a cultural than a biological process, meaning as it does "adoption into the spiritual inheritance of a nation."[1] Intermarriage, however, hastens the process because the two different cultural heritages of the contracting parties, weakened by the latent struggle of each against the other, yield more readily to the pressure of the new environment.

The threefold process of assimilation is rarely completed in the first generation. It requires at least three generations and is strengthened with the accumulation of successive generations.

The error of those who challenge the effectiveness of assimilation is either that they consider only one phase of the process, or that they expect to see the process completed in the life-span of the immigrant. This has taken place, however, on very rare occasions, and only with the exceptional individual. Generally, however, even if he has migrated as a child and has had the opportunity fully to understand the new cultural values by living in the midst of American people and totally severed from his compatriots, the immigrant cannot identify himself with the native-born. His nationalism is of a different kind, for in his consciousness still lingers the memory of his country of origin. In the case of the average adult immigrant, whose behavior patterns and thought processes have been deeply set by years of repetition and habit and for whom change is more difficult, complete assimilation is almost impossible. He achieves only the economic assimi-

[1] Fairchild, H. P., *Immigration*, New York, 1923 edition, p. 408.

lation and to some extent part of the cultural, that which enables him to understand his environment without completely participating in the full life of the community. The second generation is more likely to achieve complete assimilation, thanks to their education in American institutions. But they are held in check by the influence of their foreign-born parents, who teach them the customs and the traditions of the Old Country and thus tend to nurture in them a double allegiance to the country of their birth and to that of their adoption.

Complete assimilation is achieved beyond the third generation, when the influence of the new culture has been long enough at work to modify the psychological reactions of the immigrants or their descendants and to give them another scale of values for measuring the achievements of life. The native-born of foreign lineage comes gradually to identify himself with the spiritual values of the American community and to feel that his nationality is made up of "a composite body of ideas and ideals, beliefs, traditions, customs, habits, standards and morals, infused with loyalty, devotion, allegiance and affection." [1]

Culture is a spiritual attribute peculiar to a people and as such cannot be dual as is the contention of the advocates of the "Federation of Nationalities" theory. However, each ethnic group contributes its genius to the development of American culture, by adding its cultural heritage to the Anglo-Saxon foundation upon which the latter is built. The tide of immigration carries with it the fertile clays of different ethnic cultures and deposits them upon the Anglo-Saxon base of American culture, which is thus enriched by continuous accretions.

[1] See Fairchild, H. P., *The Melting-Pot Mistake*, Boston, 1926, p. 50.

CHAPTER X

The First and Second Generations

Elasticity of the process of assimilation. Economic and cultural assimilation of the Roumanian immigrants of the first and second generations. Presentation of cases. The case of the non-assimilable. Age, illiteracy, absence of children or of family life a hindrance to assimilation. The question of intermarriage.

A discussion of the principle and process of assimilation leads naturally to consideration of how and to what extent Roumanian immigrants and their children are reacting to their new milieu and are eliminating friction between the old and the new cultures by adapting themselves to American modes of living.

The principle of assimilation as already discussed has not been formulated *a priori*. It is based on observation of changes undergone by the Roumanian immigrant under the pressure of environment. Consequently, in dealing with his assimilation, there is no need to point out its conformity to the principle advanced. It will suffice simply to follow the modifications that the immigrant goes through, in his conscious or unconscious effort to adjust himself to the American life. It has been argued that the threefold process of assimilation — economic, cultural and ethnic — is a protracted one and that it often takes three generations, if not more, to convert a peasant from Southeastern Europe into a "perfectly good Yankee." It goes without saying that this process is re-enforced by the cumulative achievement of each generation. The further the generation under consideration is from its immigrant stock the stronger and fuller

the assimilation, for the adjustment of each generation renders that of the succeeding one easier, through better understanding of environment. But no single dogmatic rule can apply to human behavior and its reactions, which are always affected by circumstantial influences.

It has been implied in the previous discussion that assimilation is not a uniform process to which every immigrant surrenders. It varies from individual to individual, and from one generation to another, because it is directly related to temperament and natural endowment, to the ability to face change with ease, to modifications of individual behavior patterns and to acquisition of new habits acceptable to the community. Circumstantial factors, such as age, entrenched habits, literacy, and length of residence in the United States, are likely to affect the process of adjustment, and it is only in the light of these modifying factors that the results of the assimilation in the first and second generations [1] of Roumanians can be gauged. Though the ultimate goal of the adaptation of each generation is identical, their reactions to the environment, be it the American community at large or the immigrant home, greatly differ. Such adjustment is more or less satisfactory, partial or complete, according to the degree of economic, cultural and ethnic assimilation each generation is able to achieve. It might be possible to follow each generation in this threefold process and to record its respective attainments; but an understanding of the family relationships and the mutual interaction of parents and children might suffer by this method of approach. The achievements in assimilation on the part of the first and second generation of Roumanians may gain in precision and clarity by a review of a series of cases which throw into sharp relief the different reactions to environment of the young and old, literate and illiterate, foreign-

[1] See footnote 222, chapter ix.

born and native-born. The following cases are taken from the schedules of a study of one hundred Roumanian households in Chicago. They present the widest variety in assimilation — from the inadequate economic adjustment of old couples to the very successful economic and cultural adaptation of the younger people; from the maladjusted child who suffers from the lack of assimilation of his parents to the normal child, born in the United States, whose adjustment is greatly helped by a parallel progressive attitude on the part of his parents.

For the sake of acquiring a more precise idea of the different degrees displayed in the assimilative process, the one hundred households in Chicago have been roughly classified under:

(1) economic and cultural assimilation;
(2) economic assimilation with some cultural progress;
(3) cultural assimilation, but no economic progress;
(4) maladjustment.

In the first group were found families which displayed an economic evolution passing from the stage of unskilled wage-earners to that of small capitalists, and a cultural evolution which has modified the peasant traits and modes of living to make them harmonize with the prevailing American standards, which has familiarized the immigrant with the English language, and which has aroused in him the feeling of mutual help and the desire to organize, like the Americans, in order to gain the respect and appreciation of the community. In this group belong 61 families; 5 represent only the first generation of immigrants, both parents and children, of whom the following cases are illustrations:

Case I

Mr. and Mrs. B.[1] (50 and 40 years old), living on Addison street, came from the village of Comnosh, in Banat, where Mr. B. was a farm laborer and Mrs. B. helped with the work on the farm. In their desire to better their economic condition and to give greater opportunities to their only daughter, whom they left when she was scarcely one year old in the care of a good-hearted cousin, they came to the United States in 1910, and settled in Chicago. Mr. B. gave up farming, found work at the North Western Terracotta factory, where he is still employed. His wages are $35 a week. Mrs. B. took up sewing and became an expert button-hole maker. She earns $18 a week and is a member of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union of America.

Their first intention was to stay only a few years in the United States and then to return to their village. But the World War came unexpectedly and the return was postponed. In the meantime both of them had greatly improved their economic status, by perseverance in hard work with the accompanying high wages of the war period. They grew to feel so at home in this environment that they became American citizens, though they had but a spoken knowledge of the English language and their respective schooling in Banat had not gone beyond the third and second grades. After the Armistice they went in 1921 on a short visit to their village, newly annexed to Greater Roumania, and brought back with them their twelve-year-old daughter. As she could speak only Roumanian, she was sent immediately to the public schools, where she spent two years, though she had already finished the primary grades[2] in Comnosh. Both parents

[1] In all these cases to which we will refer in the course of this study we have changed the initials, out of respect for those who volunteered information.

[2] In Roumania the rural public schools have five grades as contrasted with the urban which have only four grades.

decided that she should have a more pleasant occupation than button-hole making. She was sent to a beauty parlor run by a Roumanian woman, and after three years of apprenticeship, has become an expert manicurist and hair-dresser, earning at the age of eighteen as much as her mother.

Up to 1925 the family lived in the midst of the Roumanian neighborhood, in High Street, in a modest four-family dwelling. But thanks to their thrift, they have saved enough money to buy a pleasant duplex house, in the newly developed residential section for better-class working people. The value of the house is $8,000 but it has a first mortgage which will be paid gradually in monthly installments. The B.'s live in one of the houses and rent the other at $25 a month. They enjoy a great deal of comfort, as the house is equipped with a bath-room, steam heat, electric light, a telephone, a kitchen range and laundry facilities. Nice furniture and the recreation furnished by a piano, a victrola and a Chrysler coupé contribute to their general happiness. Miss B. is particularly proud of her room, which with its privacy, its pleasant furniture, its pink silk hangings and bedspread, and the pink celluloid toilet articles on the dresser, all of which contribute to the feeling that she has fully become one of the envied bourgeoisie. She is happy with the change from the peasant cottage in Banat to the up-to-date apartment in Chicago.

The relationship between parents and daughter is very pleasant. The years of separation have undoubtedly strengthened the parental-filial love. The parents are very proud of their daughter because she has adjusted herself to American customs within six years. They take special pleasure in exhibiting how well she speaks English (although they speak Roumanian at home) despite her short stay in the United States, and in pointing out that in manners, style, and dress she is second to none. She is not allowed to do

heavy housekeeping, for fear of spoiling her well-cared-for hands. Miss B. has kept toward her parents the pronounced, tacit respect and unquestioning obedience of the European child toward its parents and elders in general.

All her earnings are turned over to her father, who has a savings account for her, and sees that every penny is kept for her dowry. Her parents take care of her and even provide for her clothing and luxuries. She never goes shopping alone, but always accompanied by her mother, whose council and advice she respects. Mother and daughter often start to their work together, but Miss B. returns home alone, as she does not like to be accompanied by a young man. She has the old village belief that this would give rise to gossip, and does not care to attract the attention of the neighborhood. She rarely takes any recreation without her parents.

Though none of them is a member of the Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies, they have a great number of friends, and they attend the Roumanian fêtes, where the daughter meets young people of her own age.

The B.'s belong to the Greek-Orthodox Church, and when they lived in the Clybourn district they attended mass regularly. But in their present neighborhood, the church is so far away that they can attend services only on special great holidays.

Their contacts with the American community, outside their occupations, are limited to friendly visits with their Czech tenants and to regular recreation furnished by the movies. The neighborhood is rather sparsely populated and the group life is not yet organized, but the B.'s seem to enjoy their new life as inhabitants of a great metropolis.

America is a nice place to live in, Mr. and Mrs. B. said. No one troubles you if you mind your business. You can become rich quickly and nobody questions who you are, so long as you lead a peaceful life and the police do not come after you. If you fol-

low the rules everything goes all right. And think of the abundant hot water, the heating system, the cars. If we were to have those things in our village, the people would make fun of us saying we had become the "Ciocoi" (self-made land-owning aristocracy). It is far better to stay here, where every one shakes hands with you, from the Mayor of the City to the Judge, without any class feeling. This is the country of the people.

The B.'s have definitely settled in the United States and both parents and daughter are working to secure a still better living.

This case deals especially with the economic and cultural assimilation of immigrant parents, who have started life at a very low level, but who have reached a higher standard of living and secured a better occupation for their daughter, thanks to their industry and perseverance and to their ability to modify old habits.

Case II

Mr. and Mrs. C. (50 and 47 years old) moved from St. Paul, Minnesota, to Chicago only two years ago, to find better opportunities for work. Mr. C. had three years of elementary education in the Old Kingdom. At home he was a farm laborer, but is at present engaged as a day-laborer in the Public Works Department of the City of Chicago, at the rate of $35.00 a week. He has no affiliation with a union but is an American citizen.

Mrs. C. is not working outside her home, but in St. Paul she was employed in the stockyards. She never went to school, is illiterate, and does not know English, though she seems very intelligent and efficient in her housekeeping. She is not eligible for citizenship on account of her inability to read and write. She realizes her shortcomings, however, and for this reason she insisted upon giving her children as much schooling as possible.

Unlike the Banatians, Mr. and Mrs. C. had six children, four sons and two daughters; but they lost four of them and have now only two sons: one married in St. Paul, the other, twenty years old, living with them. The latter was born in Roumania, but was brought up here, spending his childhood, up to his fifteenth year, in the public schools. Mr. C., unsatisfied with the casualness of his work as an unskilled laborer, encouraged his son to become a painter. At the age of twenty, the young man is earning $35.00 a week, the same wages as his father, and hopes to do better with age. He speaks English more fluently than Roumanian, though at home he endeavors to speak Roumanian for the sake of his mother.

Despite their numerous family and heavy responsibilities, Mr. and Mrs. C. have saved enough money to buy a house worth $3,000, in St. Paul, in which the married son lives. The family occupies a three-room apartment at a rental of $20.00 a month. The house has no comforts other than electric light and running water, but it is carefully kept. The standards of cleanliness and the table manners of the family are particularly good. Mr. C. and his son were found at their supper in perfectly clean shirts, but the unbearable heat forced them to roll up their sleeves. They never sit at table without changing their working clothes. Unlike many Roumanians, who take their meals on an oilcloth cover, they always use a tablecloth, and undaunted by the labor, use all the necessary silver, which they manipulate with ease, though many a time, in the Old Country, they have eaten with their hands.

Despite her illiteracy, the mother understands her son as well as does the father. She often invites her boy's sweetheart and her parents, and spares no fatigue in cooking elaborate meals and in meeting the likes and dislikes of everyone. She does not speak English, but she is glad to hear her son

talk " American ", as she says, though she does not understand it.

Father and son like to discuss politics, and while Mr. C. reads the *America* his son reads the Chicago *Tribune* and helps his father to get the American point of view. The young man, following the customary trend among young people in the United States, is interested in the " sport page " and has followed the successful career of Mr. Tunney. He himself is on the Roumanian baseball team.

The family belongs to the Greek Orthodox Church, but only the father attends mass regularly. Mrs. B. is often kept at home by her household duties, and as for the son, he likes to get up late on Sundays. All three participate little in the Roumanian group activities. The father claims that in St. Paul he was a very active member and held office in the local Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Society there. But in Chicago there are so many leaders and so many societies that he prefers the quietness of his home to the struggle for power and leadership. Parents and son have friends among the Roumanians and their Polish neighbors, whose children they often take for rides. On the whole, Mr. and Mrs. C. and their son have adapted themselves to the new Chicago environment and they do not contemplate a return home.

This case is an illustration of the assimilation of a middle-aged couple of immigrants. Despite the illiteracy of the mother and the unskilled occupation of the father, the two sons have secured better opportunities for education and occupation, thanks to the understanding of their parents. Illiteracy, though a personal shortcoming, does not jeopardize the process of assimilation, when natural intelligence and common sense are not lacking.

An assimilation similar to that undergone by the parents

and children of the first generation has been successfully achieved by childless immigrant families, though the presence of children in the foreign-born family helps to reinforce the influence of environment. The parents indeed, stimulated to work harder to give better opportunities to their children, endeavor to achieve a higher economic status, which often allows higher cultural attainments. In view of the strong attachment of the children to American modes of living, the parents give up gradually their secret hopes for a return to their native villages and definitely establish themselves in this country. This influence of children upon the immigrant family is not the only determining factor in assimilation. Many a family, despite the presence of children, has not adjusted itself to the new environment, and others have achieved a marked economic and cultural progress without the stimulus given by children. There are fifteen well-adjusted childless families, of whom the following are good illustrations:

Case III

Mr. and Mrs. M. (38 and 32 years old) have been married for twelve years. The husband came from Transylvania, as an apprentice mechanic, in 1906, and is at present employed as janitor in a tuberculosis hospital, earning $30.00 a week and his food. In his boyhood he attended school only three years, but has taught himself to read and write English, so that he enjoys newspapers and books on travel. He has become an American citizen and votes the Republican ticket. Mrs. M. is engaged by Kuppenheimer's as a button-hole maker and earns $25.00 a week. She came to the United States in 1914, from Fagarash, in Transylvania, to join her relatives, and married soon after. Her education in the Old Country did not exceed two years in the primary grades. But, thanks to the stimulus of her husband, she has learned English and

likes to read magazines such as the *Saturday Evening Post* and the *Cosmopolitan.* Mrs. M. also has become an American citizen, votes, and is a member of the Union of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, and of the Roumanian women's association — " Faith ". Their combined earnings have enabled Mr. and Mrs. M. to purchase a charming little bungalow, like a doll's house, valued at $3,000. It is entirely paid for, and offers all modern comforts—central heat, electric light, a bath-room, besides such luxuries as a victrola and a telephone.

Despite the one and a half hour distance from their home, the " Coliba," on Clybourn Street, to the center of the Roumanian activities, Mr. and Mrs. M. take an active part in the meetings of the societies " Sperantsa " and " Faith ", both business and recreational, and attend the Roumanian Greek Orthodox Church, " The Assumption of the Holy Virgin," on Webster Avenue, thanks to the easy means of transportation offered by their little Ford.

We are very happy in America [said Mr. M.] There is plenty of money and plenty to eat for those who are eager to work. We are not fond of alcohol, so we are not minding being dry. But who is sober, when it comes to speak the truth? Everyone can have as much to drink as he wants. The rich buy the stuff at great prices, the working people make their own beverages at home. If you only go to Detroit! People, there, make money by bringing liquor from Canada. But I dislike being a bootlegger, because I dread losing the respect of the community. This is dishonest work and why cheat this Country? I remember how terrible it was when the saloons were open, especially on Saturday nights, after the pay day. Now at least it is safe to go in the streets, without running into too many drunkards. Prohibition has enriched Ford. Every worker gets a car, nowadays, and instead of running to the saloons he runs out in the open country.

Mr. and Mrs. M. use a great many English words in their Roumanian speech, because they are called upon, in their occupational contacts, to deal with Americans more than with their compatriots. In their sparsely populated neighborhood, their friends are an American couple of German descent and two Roumanian families from the Banat. They are among the rare Roumanians in Chicago, from either Transylvania, the Banat or Bukovina, who, from time to time, attend the dances of the Roumanian Jews.[1] Through his work as janitor in the hospital, Mr. M. has met many of them attracted there by an eminent Roumanian Jewish physician, and thus he has come to know of the Roumanian Jewish lodges in Chicago.

Mr. and Mrs. M. are so completely satisfied with their life in the United States that they do not plan to return to the Old Country, even for a visit, as their only relatives there are cousins.

This case illustrates the contention that the cultural and economic assimilation of the first generation of immigrants is not affected by the absence of children and is chiefly a matter of personal reaction to the stimulus of the environment.

Case IV

The case of Mr. and Mrs. P. (45 and 35 years old) is one of remarkable economic prosperity, followed by a satisfactory cultural assimilation. Mr. P. is a very successful carpenter contractor and earns $120.00 a week. He came to Chicago in 1905, as a carpenter, after attending school in Transylvania for six years. He had a smattering of German, which helped him in his occupation. He taught himself English and is now able to read and write it as well as he does his own language. He married fifteen years ago a

[1] The Roumanian Jews live in totally different districts from the Roumanian Gentiles, chiefly around Douglas Park.

young woman, ten years younger than himself, whose delicate health prevented her from doing any work outside her home. Mr. P.'s successful career has enabled him to purchase a very attractive home in a residential section, with seven big rooms and all modern comforts. The house, valued at $10,000, is fully paid for. The artistic furnishings of the bungalow, the table manners and self-respecting appearance of Mr. and Mrs. P., the unusual number of first-class books of fiction, are tangible tokens of their cultural evolution, which has kept pace with their economic progress. Mrs. P.'s mother, a very clever but illiterate elderly woman, is living with them, supervising the whole household, and helping her daughter a great deal. Neither Mr. nor Mrs. P. participate in the group life of the Roumanians on account of Mrs. P.'s poor health, and they do not belong to the fraternal organizations of their countrymen. They are both American citizens and have definitely settled in the United States. Mrs. P. hates even the idea of a visit to the Old Country, though Mr. P. and his mother-in-law would eagerly return for a short period.

I hate going back to Transylvania [said Mrs. P.] I am a perfect stranger in my husband's native village and as for my own, I have a recollection of badly paved roads, of pointed roofs constantly leaking, of uncomfortable cottages, which makes me shiver at the idea of having to depart from my nice home even temporarily. Here I live like a "boereasa" (noblewoman). I go to the movies whenever I like, I listen to the radio, I go to the parks. On Sundays my husband always drives us out of the city. He has two cars and he earns more money than a general in the Roumanian army. Why give up my luxuries and return to a less comfortable life? I do not speak good Roumanian and nice people over there would make fun of me. Here I am free to do as I please. I do not care about public opinion, gossip and scandals. I never go to church and I am not interested in what

my neighbors do. I enjoy the democratic freedom that America gives. Everyone is equal, here, and you can make a fortune or lose it, it matters not. You can start all over again with no feeling of failure or of shame. This is what America is teaching you: to accept life as it comes, with its boons and its dooms. One day you are a street cleaner and the next you awake to find yourself a millionaire.

Similar progress in the economic and cultural fields has been achieved by thirty-four families in which the children are native-born and the parents have been in the United States for a period of at least fifteen years, and consequently have had a better opportunity to understand their *milieu* than have newly-arrived parents. The following cases are characteristic of this group.

Case V

Mrs. S. (27 years old) has been seventeen years in Chicago, where she came at the age of ten to accompany her mother and father. In her native village, Commosh, in the Banat, she went to school for two years and learned Roumanian, Hungarian and a little German. Two years in the public schools in Chicago taught her what English she needs efficiently to run seven beauty shops, caring for all the transactions in the absence of her husband, ill with tuberculosis, in Texas. She earns $100.00 a week. From a former marriage she has a ten-year-old daughter, who is in public school and writes equally well in English and Roumanian, though she speaks English with a great deal more ease than she does her mother tongue. The illness of the second husband has prevented the family from buying a home. Mrs. S. and her daughter live in the Clybourn Roumanian neighborhood, in a three-room, old-type apartment house, paying a rental of $20.00 a month. The home is immaculately clean, though the mother is out at work most of the day. During Mrs. S.'s

absence her daughter is taken care of by an aunt, who lives in the same dwelling. At evenings the mother supervises the work of her child. They are like comrades, playing together, going to movies and often conversing in English. Mrs. S. is planning to send her daughter to high school, and even to college, if she is fitted for it. The mother is an American citizen, votes, and participates in the activities of the Roumanian colony, despite her city-wide connections with other nationalities, such as Poles, Greeks, Czechs and Irish. She even has been the secretary of the Roumanian Women's Association in Chicago, and she is still a member of the Roumanian fraternal organization " The Immigrant ".

This case shows that the immigrant woman, when responsibilities are thrust upon her, can rise above the usual expectations of her social group and attain results which are comparable with the best achievements of Anglo-Saxon women. A longer sojourn in the United States during the years when modification of habits and adoption of new customs are easier to make, together with familiarity with the English language and the American *milieu* have been responsible for this evolution.

Case VI

Mr. A. is an automobile mechanic, thirty-two years old, earning $45.00 a week. He came to Chicago at the age of thirteen, as a farm boy, with only two elementary grades of schooling in the Old Country. He went to night school as an apprentice mechanic. After a nineteen-year sojourn in the city, he has grown to be so closely identified with the community that he has become a naturalized citizen and is very active in the Masonic Lodge. He has no affiliation with the Roumanian fraternal organizations, though his wife is the secretary of the Roumanian women's association—"Faith". She is twenty-six years old, came to Chicago from

the Banat at the age of eight, went to both public and parochial schools, and is at present working at $30.00 a week in a beauty shop, situated in the most select shopping district of the city.

Mr. and Mrs. A. have two children, born in the United States, a girl of seven and a boy of six. The former is attending the public schools, the latter the kindergarten. A German neighbor looks after them, because both parents are at work. The children speak English much better than Roumanian. As a matter of fact, their parents when at home speak more English than their mother tongue. Mr. and Mrs. A. come into very little contact with their compatriots, and only on special occasions do they participate in the parties arranged by them. They seem to enjoy more the dances and festivals of their German and Czech neighbors, which they consider more "stylish" than those of the Roumanians.

Mr. and Mrs. A. belong to the Roumanian Greek Orthodox Church, but very seldom go to the services, because they live far away from the Roumanian neighborhood. Religion does not seem to be a vital concern to them and their children do not go to Sunday-school as yet, though the mother is inclined to think that they would profit by it, even if they went to the nearby Catholic Sunday-school. Mr. and Mrs. A. feel too much a part of their new *milieu* to wish to return to their native villages. They have settled permanently in the States and contemplate, for their children, better opportunities to mix with Americans.

This case illustrates the fact that length of residence in the United States, tenacity in trying to secure a better education, continuity and perseverance at work, allegiance to the New Country and definite settlement in it without the psychological distraction of a longing for the Old Country, can transform peasants into successful city dwellers.

Case VII

Fifteen years in Chicago have allowed a former farm-laborer from Comnosh, in Banat, to become at the age of thirty-seven a foreman in the International Harvester Company, at a wage of $50.00 a week. Mr. V. had six years of elementary education in the Old Country and taught himself to read and write in English as soon as he had learned the language sufficiently through conversation and was able to decipher the mystery of English spelling. He has declared his intention to become an American citizen, but hesitates to take out his second papers because of the possibility of returning home.

Mrs. V., thirty-five years old, is working at Hart, Schaffner and Marx at $25.00 a week and is a member of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. With their combined earnings they have bought a home in Roumania, which costs $8,500. They live in a four-room apartment which is very well kept, despite the fact that Mrs. V. is daily at the factory. The rent is $20.00 a month.

Mr. and Mrs. V. have a fourteen-year-old boy, who has almost completed work at the public school. He also attends regularly the parochial school, which meets on Saturday afternoons throughout the school year, and daily for two hours throughout the summer vacation. He is very clever and is often asked to act as monitor in both the public and the parochial schools. The home is very comfortable and the family table well provided with the home-made wine and beer customary in the Roumanian household. In 1920 the family went for two years to the Old Country, but not sympathizing with conditions there, returned to the United States. Mr. and Mrs. V. would contemplate returning to Roumania at a later period providing their son would accompany them; but the boy is very promising, and both parents

and teachers encourage him to pursue his studies in high school, and perhaps in college. The father is religious and sings in the Roumanian Greek Orthodox Church. He is anxious for his son to be proud of his traditions, and the boy goes to church regularly and observes the ritual of the Orthodox Church.

Mr. and Mrs. V. keep a single boarder, a friend of theirs whose family has returned to Roumania. Aside from the financial advantage which the presence of the lodger offers, he stimulates the conversation by his judicious remarks on politics, financial questions, markets, etc., and by all the gossip he hears at the coffee-house or the pool-room. Mrs. V. and her husband go out little, but they are very hospitable and like to have company and to learn something new. Without being too isolated from the remainder of the Roumanian community, they mix little with it, because of lack of time. The boy, however, is sociable and is a leader among the children of the neighborhood. His attitude toward his parents is very commendable. He speaks to them with due reverence and respect, and does all the errands for his mother, without begrudging the fact that he is taken away from his games. He is attentive and helpful and seems to be endowed with the gift of making friends. His favorite friend is a journalist, who often drops in at meal times and entertains the family with all kinds of stories, political anecdotes from Austria-Hungary and Roumania; the deeds of Iancu Jianu, the well-known mountaineer thief; the adventures of Nae, the gypsy tinker; or the popular ballad "Mioritsa." Thus the boy, together with his parents, has an opportunity to get better acquainted with the Old Country cultural heritage, which captures his imagination.

This case illustrates the fact that assimilation for either the first or second generations does not necessarily mean eradication of all immigrant traits. The native-born child

of Roumanian parentage becomes easily adapted to the American life, through the school. But he can also maintain a feeling of allegiance to the Old Country, when the attitude of the parents is conciliatory enough to accept the changes necessitated by the new culture as well as to safeguard the respect and admiration for the old.

Case VIII

Mr. C., a forty-seven year old cement finisher, earns $100.00 a week, working overtime, often twelve to fourteen hours a day, at $1.10 an hour. He came to the United States in 1906 as a farm laborer, worked on the railroads for a while, and then began cement work. In 1910 he went home to marry and returned to Chicago in the course of the same year.

His wife, forty years old, is working at Hart, Schaffner & Marx, at the extraordinary rate of $45.00 a week, chiefly made at piece work. She is illiterate and does not speak English, not even in the factory, where she works with women of her own nationality. But she had become an American citizen, through her marriage, prior to the enactment of the Cable Law, September 22, 1922,[1] and is a member of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. Though handicapped by lack of knowledge of the English language, she does not wish to go back to the Old Country. She realizes that the United States offers better opportunities of advancement to every individual and she is anxious to have her two children benefit by them.

[1] Prior to the enactment of this Law any alien women, married to a citizen, became automatically a citizen herself. But since this law went into effect, an alien woman who has married a citizen, or whose husband is naturalized since the law passed, remains an alien, until she is naturalized separately. (See Roche, Josephine, "The Effect of the Cable Law on the Citizenship Status of Foreign Women," *Conference of Social Work*, 1925, p. 611.)

The boy, born in the United States, is, at the age of sixteen years, in the second year of the Lane Technical School. The girl, eleven years old, is still going to public school and her parents plan to have her continue her studies in high school. Until 1925, the family lived in the midst of the Roumanian neighborhood, on Greenview street. Since that time they have bought, in a newly developed residential district, a seven-room house at $10,000 and have moved into it. The home is very comfortable, with a bath-room, steam heat, electric light, victrola and telephone, and is beautifully kept. The brother and the sister enjoy the privacy of their respective rooms. The family has no car as yet, though the house has a garage.

The son plays the violin and the parents are anxious that he should give much of his time to the study of music. Though far away from the Fullerton-Clybourn district, the family attends the fêtes of the Roumanians. Within the immediate neighborhood there are ten or fifteen Roumanian families, but the nearest neighbors are Americans, Germans, Poles or Serbians, with whom new contacts are established, through " back door " conversation. Mr. and Mrs. C. are Greek Orthodox, but since they moved into their new neighborhood they seldom go to church. However, they insist that their children take communion four times a year as is required by the Greek Orthodox Church, and abstain from eating meat for a whole week. They both belong to the fraternal organization " Sperantsa ", but have no other insurance policy. The children have a great deal of freedom in their relations with their parents, who, respecting this American tendency, are less severe in their discipline than most Roumanian parents. The boy is allowed to accompany his sister to small parties within the neighborhood, when the parents do not feel like chaperoning them. Brother and sister do little in the house, which is entirely in Mrs. C.'s

care, but sometimes they help with the dishes or the weeding of the garden.

Mr. C. reads the *America* assiduously, while his children enjoy the funnies or any fiction dealing with expeditions, warriors, fairies, etc. The boy was reading " Uncle Tom's Cabin."

This case demonstrates the fact that illiteracy does not always jeopardize the economic and cultural evolution of the immigrant. Parents with limited educational facilities may succeed in adjusting themselves to the new environment and in securing better opportunities of education and of occupation for their children.

Case IX

Mr. and Mrs. O. came to Chicago in 1910. Like most of the Roumanians in the Clybourn-Fullerton colony, they came from the Banat, having left their village, San-Nicolas, to escape dire poverty. Both had a very limited education. Mr. O. went only one year to the elementary school, Mrs. O. scarcely three months. Previous to their arrival in this country they were employed as domestic servants. Mr. O. admitted that he never slept in a room. The haystack was his sleeping quarters, while in the winter months he used to find refuge in the barn. After coming to the States, seventeen or eighteen years ago, Mr. O. worked as a day-laborer for a period of nine months. Then he became a carpenter's apprentice, because of his skill with his hands. He is at present a furniture joiner, earning $45.00 a week. He has had a keen interest in educational, cultural and social activities. He confessed that he knew little of reading or writing, but he was so anxious to learn that he achieved partial self-education by reading daily the *America*. In the course of years he was appointed secretary of the paternal organization " Sperantsa ". He was distressed about keep-

ing the minutes, but other officers or former secretaries helped him, and he proved very worthy of their confidence. For a time he was a member of the Roumanian Socialist Club of Chicago, whose cultural activities he greatly enjoyed; but as he lives an hour's distance from the meeting quarters of the club, he has dropped his membership. He especially finds pleasure in participating in social activities, so that he has joined the Community House of the neighborhood, where he meets many other workers belonging to different nationalities—Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Serbians, etc.. He is also fond of his home, which is very nicely furnished, and takes a great deal of pride in showing that within seventeen years he has become a proprietor and a self-respecting American citizen, never shirking his civic and political duties.

Mrs. O., thirty-seven years old, adds to the family income by working in the men's clothing industry at a wage of $25.00 a week. She is absorbed by her household occupations during her free hours, so that she never availed herself of the opportunity to improve culturally. Though she has been steadily employed in the clothing industry, she speaks scarcely any English, having kept always with the Roumanian workers. She is a member of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, but she has never taken any active part in the Roumanian Women's Association. However, she attends, with her family, the parties given by the Roumanian colony.

Mr. and Mrs. O. have purchased a home, in a new residential section, in the northwestern part of Chicago, at the cost of $10,000. The house is not yet fully paid for, as there is a first mortgage on it. It is a large comfortable bungalow, with seven rooms, a bath-room, steam heat, electric light and a telephone. The house is perfectly well kept, but an old habit survives, that of using the house as a display of the

economic independence of the family. Thus instead of using the beautiful dining room, whenever there are no visitors, the family takes its meals in the summer kitchenette, which is in the basement, adjoining the furnace. But this is a labor-saving device in household economy which is not infrequent with people of a better social standing.

The father's influence in educational matters upon his fifteen-year-old boy, born in the United States, has kept him in public school for eight years. But the boy is very tall for his age and feels ashamed to go on to high school. He is not much attracted to the pursuit of higher studies, because he is more successful in hand work and craftsmanship, drawing, carpentry, etc. He is anxious to earn his own living, and he will probably become a carpenter, as his father, or a mechanic. He was not very decided on the matter, but was determined to become self-supporting. His playmates are all Roumanian boys and girls from the vicinity, but they often speak English together, because most of them have been educated in the American schools and do not find the proper words to express their ideas in their mother tongue.

Mr. and Mrs. O. are Greek Orthodox, but only Mr. O. attends church, his wife being absorbed in her household duties. The son often accompanies his father to the church, but one cannot say that his interest in religious questions is paramount. He accepts church-going as a mere traditional habit, without questioning its implications. He is very fond of his mother and likes to tease her by playing all kinds of tricks, such as hiding her glasses, putting salt instead of sugar into her coffee and making fun of her broken English. But she is very receptive and quick in her answers and she rather enjoys it, though the father earnestly believes in exercising his paternal authority and in reprimanding his son. On such occasions the mother does not question her husband's judgment, but accepts his authority, because she is

rather old-fashioned and still believes that in the last resort the family's responsibilities lie with the husband.

On the whole, from the appearance of the house, the behavior of the parents and the self-assertion of the boy, the family seems to have progressed greatly in the process of economic and cultural adjustment. This case shows that the evolution of the second generation is not always along the lines planned by the first generation. Despite the parent's aspirations for a higher cultural life, their son's lack of ambition in this direction need not prevent his becoming a useful member of society. He can achieve the average economic and social adjustment, which makes the immigrant and his descendants integral parts of the life of the community, without necessarily pushing them to higher occupational and cultural achievements.

Seven more families belong to this first group representative of economic and cultural assimilation. They include not only the first and second generations of immigrants but also three generations of people. An illustration will help to gauge the effect of environment upon the grandparents, the parents and their children.

Case X

Mr. M., fifty-two years old, is a successful baker, earning $40.00 a week. He emigrated alone, in 1904, to better his economic situation. Three years later he returned to his native village, San Nicolas, in Banat, to marry, and then brought his young wife to the United States. Both husband and wife were illiterates at the time of their arrival, and they made no effort to overcome this shortcoming. They learned to speak English quite easily, because in addition to their native Roumanian, they had already a smattering of German and a fluent knowledge of Hungarian. Mrs. M. worked in a laundry until 1925, when her daughter married,

and she was forced to stay at home to prepare the meals for the whole family. Despite their illiteracy, both Mr. and Mrs. M. succeeded in saving enough money to buy, in the residential section, a home valued at $10,000. The bungalow has a first mortgage, which is being gradually paid off in monthly instalments. It has every modern comfort and the family enjoys the luxury of a telephone, a piano, a victrola and a car. Mr. and Mrs. M. have not become American citizens on account of their inabiltiy to read and write; neither have they joined the Roumanian fraternal organizations, though they have always taken their recreation in the midst of their compatriots, participating in their fêtes. According to the Old Country custom of having the married children live with their parents, their only daughter, eighteen years old, her husband and her newly-born baby live with them. The daughter, Mrs. T., was born in the United States and has graduated from the public school. Like her mother, she took up laundry work, and still carries it on, earning $18.00 a week, though she is not in need, her husband's wages being $50.00 a week. They have no rent to pay, as part of the house is her own dowry. The ambition and desire of acquisition of these Roumanians are so strong that they use all their earning power to accumulate more riches.[1] The young woman enjoys her work thoroughly and she deems it more natural for her mother to stay at home and take care of the baby than for her mother to work, because a woman is considered "too old" to go to work when she has married children or is beyond forty. Mrs. T. married at seventeen (the usual marital age in the Old Country), and her husband is twelve years older than she. Hers was a conventional mar-

[1] Not only this isolated case, but in most of the cases studied, the Roumanians do not lack acquisitiveness and ambition and often the comfortably established Roumanian mother likes to add, to the total income of the family, her own earnings.

riage, which turned into very happy marital relations. Her parents encouraged her to accept the "splendid party," because the young man was earning high wages, did not drink and had a very good reputation. Mr. T. has been in the United States twenty years, and learned English in night schools. The young couple speak better English than Roumanian, but for the sake of the old people they try to speak Roumanian, at least at home. The baby is only six months old, but the grandmother speaks Roumanian to him, and he seems to understand both languages. Mr. and Mrs. T. are American citizens, the former by naturalization, the latter by birth, and they both go to the polls. They do not contemplate going to Roumania, unless it should be for a short visit, Even the old people have no desire to go back to their native villages, because they prefer to stay with their only daughter and her family. Mr. and Mrs. T. do not belong to any Roumanian fraternal organization, but like their parents, they attend the gatherings of their compatriots. However, they especially enjoy their personal friends, who happen to be their German next-door neighbors. Their social contacts with the American community are limited to those established through their occupation; but thanks to friendly ties they are getting to know other points of view and to broaden their understanding of America. Seeking leisure and excitement, which is the keynote of their environment, they often go to movies or take long rides, after supper, leaving their baby in the care of Mrs. M., who is very happy to stay at home, as she does not enjoy the "rushing" of the young generation. However, on Sundays the whole family, including Mr. and Mrs. M., their daughter and son-in-law and their grandchild, go riding or visiting friends.

This case shows a very marked economic advance on the part of both the older and the younger people, which helps to bind them more strongly to the American environment.

The old couple, however, has not advanced in its cultural evolution beyond the appropriation and enjoyment of the material comforts of life. The daughter and the son-in-law are better assimilated culturally, through their contacts with the public schools and night classes, their occupation, their knowledge of English, their American citizenship, and their personal friends. But they have not developed the sense of service to the group or the community, so largely characteristic of American civic life. They are more intent in the pursuit of their own happiness than in the betterment and progress of their ethnic group.

Despite the fact that economic prosperity greatly helps the process of assimilation and often hastens a cultural adjustment, there are immigrant families who do not go beyond the stage of economic independence and who show an arrested cultural development. In this *second group* (i. e. "Economic assimilation with some cultural progress") there are only twelve families, of whom eight were literate and four illiterate. They represent chiefly those whose goal is "money making" rather than the betterment of one's life or occupation, or the pursuit of a higher education. The following cases are vivid pictures of partial assimilation.

Case XI

Mr. and Mrs. U. (50 and 47 years old) settled in Chicago in 1914. Mr. U., now a cement worker earning $55.00 a week, was a farm laborer previous to his arrival in the United States. He has had six years of elementary education in his village in Banat. He learned English without any help and can write and read it as well as he does his mother tongue. He has become an American citizen, apparently for the sake of convenience and to command the respect of the cosmopolitan neighborhood in which the family lives. But he does not vote, and, except for membership in the

union, he does not take any active part in the Roumanian gatherings. Mrs. U. is illiterate and does not speak English, despite her fourteen years' sojourn in the United States and her employment as a cook by the public schools. She is not an American citizen. She is very conservative and still wears a 'kerchief tied under the chin. She earns $8.00 a week for only four hours' work a day, and gets a pailful of food, which is sufficient to feed the whole family.

The children are: a twenty-one year old boy, born in the Old Country; a daughter nineteen years old, who is married and lives in Detroit; another daughter seventeen years old, born in Banat; and the youngest member of the family, a thirteen-year-old boy, the only one born in the United States. The illiteracy of the mother and the incomplete cultural assimilation of the father have affected the cultural development of the children. The oldest boy has had only four years of schooling, including both that in his native village and that in the American school. He is a janitor, earning $25.00 a week. The seventeen-year-old daughter has graduated from the American public school and works in a laundry at $16.00 a week. The youngest boy is still attending school. None of the children has had the opportunity of attending High School, because the emphasis of the parents was put on money-making. Everyone of the children has become self-supporting as soon as it was possible. Though the combined earnings of the family are now adequate to provide a comfortable home, these people still live in a small three-room apartment, paying $27.00 rent per month. The home is very simple, but clean, and the only comforts enjoyed are electric light and a victrola. The family prefers to hoard money rather than enjoy luxuries. They all seem to be driven by the mania of "dollar making," and they have money at the Fullerton State Bank.

The family is of Greek Orthodox faith, but only the

mother goes to church regularly. The father does not care about religious matters, and as he does not set the example, his children prefer company to going to church and hearing the priest utter incomprehensible words.

The older brother and sister go out together and make a great deal of fuss about their stylish clothes. They feel embarrassed by the old-fashioned dress of their mother and avoid going out with her. They like to speak English among themselves and to show what "good Americans" they are. They are rather noisy and boisterous and the father often orders them to be silent. No member of the family is affiliated with the Roumanian fraternal organizations, but the children attend regularly the Roumanian dances and fêtes, to which they bring their Hungarian friends.

This case shows that economic progress does not necessarily entail cultural evolution and that the outward conformity to the prevailing standards does not mean an understanding of the cultural implications of one's environment.

Case XII

Mr. and Mrs. N. (42 and 38 years old) came to Chicago in 1910. In the course of seventeen years they have done little to adapt themselves to the new environment from the standpoint of cultural achievements. Their illiteracy has prevented them from becoming American citizens, and they have never joined in the life of the Roumanian group. They have almost no contact with any one of the social organizations, American or Roumanian. Their sole interest in life is money-making. Despite their shortcomings, cultural and social, they have succeeded in bettering their economic situation. They have been three times to Roumania to visit relatives. There they bought a home, but are quite uncertain whether they will return to Banat or whether they will stay in America. The man is a garage cleaner and earns $25.00

a week. The wife keeps six boarders and she clears nearly $40.00 a week. They have had two boys both of whom died in infancy. Their only living child is a six-year-old girl, born in the United States. She is much overweight for her age and has the same gluttonous appetite as her parents. She does not seem particularly bright and alert, but she is the only English-speaking person in the family, having learned the language from her playmates. She is often called to be an interpreter for her mother and father, who have but a smattering of English. She is permitted a great deal of freedom and all her vagaries, desires for candy, gum, etc. are satisfied, because the parents hate to see her cry. This is another proof of Mr. and Mrs. N.'s inability to control a situation which is within the power of every mother and father. The fact that they rely upon her as an interpreter gives her more attention than she ought to have.

Both Mr. and Mrs. N. are anxious to accumulate as much money as they possibly can for the dowry of their daughter. "If she is rich, she will marry a wealthy man and she will be happy," they said, not realizing that happiness is not secured only through the accumulation of dollars and cents.

Mr. and Mrs. N. are Greek Orthodox, but they never go to church. They lead a sedentary and secluded life, spending all their free time at card-playing or drinking with their lodgers. Their neighbors claim that they have over $50,000 in the bank and suspect that bootlegging has been the chief source of that great fortune. Whether this is true or simply a rumor begotten by envy, the fact remains that thus far the only adjustment of this family to the new environment is their economic independence and a certain material comfort enjoyed in the home. Otherwise their life, their traditions, their habits, their shortcomings have not been modified, despite their long sojourn in the United States. The mother, owing to her occupation, had no outside contact with the

American community and has been denied the stimulus of other Roumanian or American women who go to the factory. Practically the only social intercourse the family has is with the boarders, most of whom are Roumanian men.

In the *third group* (i. e. "cultural assimilation, but no economic progress") only four families were classified, two being literate and two illiterate. These families failed to secure the economic stage of a proprietor or a small capitalist, and scarcely succeeded in balancing their budgets. But they have realized that knowledge is the keynote to progress and have encouraged the second generation to acquire an education both in the schools or through participation in the group life of the community.

Case XIII

Mr. and Mrs. S. (33 and 27 years old) have lived in Chicago for four years, moving from Detroit, where they were married nine years ago. Mr. S. came to America at the age of eleven, accompanying his parents, who left Bukovina to improve their economic condition. He went for four years to a Roumanian primary school in his native village, and upon his arrival in the States his family sent him to public school, where he stayed two more years. As his father was a mason, he himself became interested in the building trades, and is at present a roofer, earning $40.00 a week. His occupation carries him to all parts of the city and he works mostly for American contractors, and is himself an American citizen who feels the necessity of making the "right connections" instead of being thrown constantly upon the Roumanian colony.

Mrs. S. was born in Transylvania and accompanied her family to Detroit, at the age of nine. Her education consisted of two years in the primary grades in the Roumanian school in Salishte and three years in the public schools in

Detroit. Before her marriage she worked with her mother at the Overall Carhart factory and was a member of the United Garment Workers' Union, but gave up her work to devote all her time to the care of her three children, two little girls of eight and seven who attend the public school, and a little boy of six who goes to the kindergarten. The children speak English not only among themselves during play hours, but also with their parents. Only when friends and visitors come to the house do they hear the Roumanian language, and they cannot speak it.

Mr. S. is a Greek Orthodox, but his wife is a Greek Catholic, and in accordance with their understanding previous to their marriage, the children are baptized in the Greek Catholic church and attend the Sunday-school at St. Joseph's, the Polish church of the vicinity. Mrs. S. repays her husband's respect for her religious belief by a strong attachment to the Bukovinian group, to which he is very devoted.

The family has moved from the stockyard district, where most of the Bukovinians live, into the Clybourn Roumanian neighborhood. The earnings of the father, though adequate for the daily necessities of life, have not enabled him to buy a home. Mr. and Mrs. S. rent a four-room apartment for $21.00 a month. The only comforts enjoyed are electric light and running water. Their chief luxury is a victrola. The house is nicely furnished, well kept, and the children enjoy the little front garden, where they play at liberty instead of running in the streets as many others do. Neither Mr. S. nor Mrs. S. is a member of the Roumanian fraternal organizations in Chicago or elsewhere and they scarcely even participate in the group life of their Banatian neighbors. Almost every night, however, Bukovinians from Forty-third street South visit them and they either dance or sing "doinas" (pastoral songs) from Bukovina. This clannishness is typical of the strength of regional allegiances, which overshadow at times the ethnic homogeneity.

" We certainly are Roumanians [said Mrs. S.] but don't you see we use other expressions than those of the Transylvanians or the Banatians? Their pronunciation is different and they have many words that we do not understand, so we keep to our own co-villagers. But when it comes to national fetes, such as the Tenth of May, or when the ' Imperateasa ' (the Empress, meaning her Majesty Queen Marie of Rumania) comes here with her children, we do not think of ourselves as Bukovinians, Banatians or Transylvanians, but we all feel a Roumanian colony which must combine its efforts in order to show to the Americans that we are capable of organizing and of doing as well as the Poles, the Czechs or the other nationalities."

Mr. and Mrs. S. read the American newspapers and are not interested in the development of the Roumanian fraternal organizations. They do not contemplate returning to Bukovina, because " life here is more pleasant than in the Old Country," and they are glad that here their children will have better opportunities for a higher education and a happier life.

This case illustrates the fact that despite the relative economic achievements of these parents, length of residence in the United States and ability to speak English have contributed greatly to the adaptation of these immigrants to their environment and to helping their children to adjust themselves better to the American life.

Case XIV

Mr. and Mrs. T. (48 and 45 years old) have never moved from the " Greenhouse " neighborhood, where they came in 1910. Since both were illiterate, they have been satisfied with whatever work they could get, and as ignorance is often allied to conservatism, Mr. T. has kept his employment in a greenhouse, where he is earning $35.00 a week. His wife is a school cleaner and makes $7.00 a week. The husband

has learned to speak English, but neither he nor his wife has become an American citizen nor have they ever joined a fraternal organization. They are simple folk, enjoying their work, and are satisfied with life in the United States, though they have never saved enough money to buy a home and are still living in a rented house, paying $20.00 per month. They have realized, however, the shortcomings of their illiteracy and have made all sacrifices to give their son opportunities for education and for a better occupation. The young man is twenty-one years old, was born in Banat, but was brought up in the United States. He has graduated from the public schools and has become a successful barber, earning $40.00 a week. He is a member of the Barbers' Union, has little contact with the Roumanian life, and endeavors to mix with Americans.

This case shows that despite their illiteracy and their modest economic progress, the parents greatly value cultural attainments and have secured for their son a setting for the development of his activities.

Finally, in the *fourth group* (i. e. "maladjustment") twenty-three households were listed, representing a great variety of people: families who failed to modify their habits and secure a higher economic status; old couples handicapped by their illiteracy, their inability to speak English or their conservative attitude; single people of all ages and marital conditions, single men, married men separated from their families, divorced people, widows and widowers. Besides these categories there are others, who despite a long residence in the United States and their relatively satisfactory economic situation, have not succeeded in making the due adjustment to their new environment. Illiteracy, old age, inability to change one's traditions, lack of courage in the struggle of life or lack of understanding between the mem-

bers of the family, have been responsible for creating friction and maladjustment. The following cases are but illustrations of the types of mal-adjusted Roumanian families.

Case XV

Mr. and Mrs. I. (42 and 40 years old) have been married for eighteen years, but their marital relations have been tense, due to the fact that Mrs. I. believed that she was making a bad match in her second marriage with an uncouth, uncivilized, illiterate man. She considers herself superior to him, because of her four grades in the primary school. Her former husband was a farmer in Banat. She claims to have been forced to leave him because her father-in-law tried to make love to her. She is very superstitious and seems to suffer from delusions. She is a laundress, making $12.00 a week, but is out of work most of the time because of her ill-health. Her home, in an unhealthy three-room basement, always flooded when it rains, is very poorly kept, dirty, and untidy. It is rented at $10.00 a month.

Mr. I. is a cement worker, earning $30.00 a week. He came to the United States in 1903 and brought his wife in 1909. Despite his twenty years in America he has but a smattering of English, is not a citizen, and has never joined any of the Roumanian fraternal organizations. He has moved so often from place to place and from city to city that he has never given a comfortable home to his family.

Mr. and Mrs. I. have two boys. The elder, sixteen years of age, works in the summer time to defray his expenses through High School. The younger, eight years old, is only in his first grade. Both of them speak English between themselves, but Roumanian with their parents. The younger boy is quite sensitive and suffers from the untidiness of his mother. During the interview he asked his mother to fix her hair and readjust her 'kerchief. He resents the fact that

he was kept from school on account of the continuous ill-health of his mother. His playmates tease him for "being in a class with the babies" and he loses his temper and fights them. Mrs. I. has no control over her children and Mr. I. inflicts corporal punishment on them each time he catches them playing wildly in the streets. The boys feel bitterly the severe discipline of their father and are gruff in their answers to him, which does little to relieve the tense relationship.

The father attends the Greek Orthodox church regularly, because he is very superstitious. He forces his sons to accompany him, but they run away and play in the churchyard.

The family holds aloof from the group life of its neighbors, and the only contact with the community is that with the school. There is no recreation taken in common. The mother stays at home, most of the time lying on her bed and day-dreaming. The father goes to the pool-room or the coffee-house and the boys do as they please.

It is obvious that the friction between the parents and their failure to understand their environment and their children show their own maladjustment and indicate the poor chances that the children have to make an adequate adjustment to life in the midst of such an unsatisfactory home environment.

Case XVI

Mr. D. (43 years old) is an iceman, earning $50.00 a week. He came to America from the Old Kingdom in 1910; gave up farming and worked in Chicago as a day-laborer until he took up his present occupation, two years after his arrival. In 1910 he brought his wife to Chicago, where his only daughter was born. Mother and daughter stayed with him until 1926, when they returned to Roumania. The daughter was nearing the marital age, and as Mr. and Mrs.

D. had no intention of spending their old age in the United States, they decided to have their daughter marry in Roumania, where they have bought a house. Mr. D. remained in Chicago with the hope of joining his wife and daughter within two years. He speaks English fluently, having been, ever since he began delivering ice, with a German "boss" who had taken a great liking to him and followed his progress closely. But he reads and writes only in his mother tongue. He is not a citizen, as he has always intended to go back to his native village. "The United States is a splendid country," said he, "especially for young working people, who can make money by persevering in their work. I am always working overtime, so that I average twelve hours of work a day. It is hard labor. The Americans would not stand the strain. It is good for the time being, while I am still strong, but it is too hard for aged people, so that I am hoping to return home to spend my old age."

Mr. C. is a member of the Union, and also of the Roumanian fraternal organization "Sperantsa", but he spends most of his spare time at home, with his friends with whom he boards. He likes political discussions and reads the daily *America* from beginning to end. From the standpoint of the American community he seems a well-adjusted individual, self-respecting, self-supporting, carrying on his family responsibilities. But psychologically he is not adjusted. He misses his wife and daughter, and each time that his friends drink to "the health of the absent ones," he adds: "God knows, next year by this time I might be drinking to your health with them."

Case XVII.

Mr. A. (58 years old) left his wife, a daughter and a son in Sarcush, near Temishioara (Temesvar), because his wife was afraid to cross the ocean when he came to the United

States in 1906. He went directly to St. Louis and stayed there until 1922, having steady employment in a factory. He then moved to Chicago where he earns $25.00 a week in a radio factory, which also gives a bonus of $6.00 or $7.00 per week. He lives in the seven-room basement of a boarding house, with ten other men, single or married, and separated from their families. He shares a room with an old friend of his, whom he came to join in Chicago because life was too forlorn for him. He is neither a citizen nor a member of a fraternal organization, but he carries an insurance policy. He considers himself too old to participate in the life of his group. His only recreation is reading, as he has had nine years of education, in both the Roumanian and the Hungarian schools, and even a month of night school in St. Louis. He has never been home to visit his family, so he is much excited at the idea of meeting his married daughter, who has given him two grandchildren, and his son, who married recently. He hopes to return soon, as he feels himself getting old, but, attracted by the idea that he can earn in one month in the United States as much money as he would by working a whole year in Roumania, he hesitates to leave and keeps postponing his departure. With his own savings he has bought a house in his native village, but part of his earnings went toward his daughter's dowry and he does not like the idea of returning home without his pocketbook full of money. "I do not want to be a burden to the young," he says. But most of all, he is afraid that he might no longer like the monotony of village life. He is unsettled, though he dreams daily of going back.

Case XVIII

Mr. B. is a cement worker who earns $60.00 a week. He came as a farmer, in 1912, at the age of twenty-two, worked for a while as a day-laborer, then engaged in cement work,

within six months of his arrival. In 1920 he returned home to marry the girl promised to him, but he left his wife in Comnosh, his native village in the Banat, and came back to the United States to make some money, though he had already purchased a house in his native village. He boards with his sister-in-law and brother-in-law, so that he is well cared for, and he shares in their family life. But he misses his own wife and little daughter, whom he has never seen, as she was born after he had left Roumania.

"I am working as hard as I can [said he], to make money very rapidly and to return to peasant life, to till our land. Here one must work hard, until the very last moment of his life. But I will make enough to live there a comfortable life."

He is neither a citizen nor a member of the Roumanian organization, but he carries on his membership with the Union. He speaks English quite easily and reads the Roumanian newspapers, which is part of his recreation. He spends a great deal of his spare time, on Sundays, at the coffee-house, or the Roumanian Hall "Coliba", and participates from time to time in the Roumanian fêtes.

Case XIX

Mr. I. V., forty-four years old, left his family in St. Paul, Minnesota, and came to Chicago in 1927, to work in a brewery for $32.00 a week. Previous to his immigration to the United States he had gone to South America,[1] but as his

[1] Previous to the Great War the Roumanian immigration to South America was very small, almost unnoticeable. But since the American immigration restrictions of 1921 and 1924, part of the stream which was destined to reach the United States has found its way to Brazil, whose government has made especially favorable conditions for agricultural laborers, offering them free transportation. The number of petitions for passports and Roumanian passports issued for Brazil totalled 14,661 for the year 1925 as compared with 6,948 for the year 1924. Roumanian immigration to the United States reduced from 10,373 in 1924 to 2,591 in 1925, a result of the application of the Quota Law of 1924. (See: *Buletinul Muncei for years 1924-1927* and the *Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration.*)

wife refused to join him he returned to his native village in Hungary (Banat). After a year he sailed for the United States, and settled in St. Paul, Minn., in 1904, where he was engaged in a brewery. In 1912 his wife and son joined him, and a daughter was born to the family in 1913. The family kept together until 1926, when a misunderstanding between husband and wife forced Mr. V. to leave his wife and daughter in his home in St. Paul and to come alone to Chicago. His son had gone to work in Detroit. He lives in a boarding house run by a middle-aged Roumanian couple, and seems to get along very well with the other boarders. He is a polyglot, speaking Roumanian, Hungarian, English, German, and even a little Spanish, but can write and read only Roumanian and English. He is a citizen, has been a member since 1909 of the International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, and Soft Drink Workers of America, and he carries insurance, but he does not belong to a Roumanian society. He does not consider returning to Roumania except perhaps on a visit, but neither does he wish to go back to his wife in St. Paul. He misses his daughter a great deal, and his reluctance to speak of his wife is a token that he has a serious grudge against her which he does not like to confess. He suspects his wife of unfaithful conduct and feels ashamed to speak of it. He would divorce her if it were not that his daughter would suffer from the bad reputation of her mother, as any divorced person, with the Roumanians, loses the respect of the community. He declares that he must be patient and bear his lonely life courageously, until his daughter gets married and he can go and live with her. The separation from his family renders him nervous and restless.

Case XX

A case of complete unadjustment to environment is that of Mrs. I., a fifty-five year old widow, who has suffered a

miserable existence in Chicago since she lost her husband nine years ago. She came with him, in 1909, hoping to make money, but all the savings went for the dowry of their only daughter, who was left in the Old Country in the care of an aunt. Mrs. I. is illiterate, not a citizen, and speaks only Roumanian. She has never belonged to a fraternal organization, nor did her husband belong, so that she has neither a widow's pension nor any other help. She works in a laundry and earns $15.00 a week. She lives in a single room, in the basement of a house, for which she pays $5.00 a month. Though the basement has neither light nor good ventilation, the room is very well kept and is immaculately clean. She is so totally cut off from any contact with her Roumanian neighbors that she does not even know their names. She is handicapped not only by illiteracy but also by a short memory. She could not remember even her husband's family name and she kept repeating his Christian name. She is very lonely and sees no one. At times she gets a breath of fresh air by going to the front yard of the house, but she seems to be diffident about meeting people and making friends. She hopes and prays daily to return to Comnosh, in Banat, to her married daughter. She is trying, from her scanty earnings, to save enough money to pay for the trip over. She refuses to ask any help from her daughter, because she knows that in Roumanian money her trip amounts to a great sum of *Lei* which her daughter is incapable of providing.

The twenty cases just reviewed have helped to illustrate the great variety of assimilation, which both the first and the second generations of Roumanians have undergone in the short span of twenty-five years of their sojourn in the United States.

The proportion of families in the four categories does not express a percentage nor does it prove that in any other

Roumanian colony one could expect to find the same number of assimilated and unassimilated families, or the same classification within a hundred Roumanian households. It merely illustrates the fact that the process of assimilation differs from individual to individual, from first to second generation, and from illiterate to literate people, and that all the stages of evolution are to be found within the range of one hundred Roumanian immigrant households.

The conclusion drawn from these cases is that assimilation, both in its economic and cultural aspects, does not differ greatly for the immigrant children and the second generation, as the influence of the environment upon the young people is the same, only it is deeper and stronger than it is among the older persons who encounter a great deal of psychological friction in endeavoring to change their habits. Cultural and economic assimilation seems to be more easily achieved by the young people, be they immigrants or natives. It goes without saying that their education in America has a great bearing on the modifications in habits, customs, and traditions. Differences in receptivity are due to age, illiteracy or to a greater or lesser ability to learn the English language. Youth and literacy have been among the stronger factors contributing to the assimilative process. Illiteracy has affected the cultural assimilation of the immigrant but has had little bearing upon his economic success, because illiterate people have often succeeded in reaching the same economic level as those who had some elementary education, while literate people, with a keen interest in cultural achievements, have not always succeeded in securing the economic independence necessary to meet the needs of every member of the family.

As to the third stage in the process of assimilation, that of intermarriage, it needs to be studied more fully. The observation of the Roumanians in seventeen different cities and towns where they have settled, and more specifically of those

in Chicago, showed that there was little racial amalgamation among them. The interesting fact is that, whenever intermarriage has taken place among the immigrants of the first generation, it has been between Roumanians and other nationalities or racial stock, rather than between Roumanian immigrants and Americans.[1] No specific study of this fact was made. But conversation and correspondence with Roumanian priests lead to the belief that the class of industrial workers opposes intermarriage because of the natural conservatism inherent in people either with limited education, which makes them cling strongly to their traditions, or with a strong nationalistic feeling, which guides their choice in such a way as not to undermine the integrity of their ethnic heritage.

The rare cases of intermarriage observed among the Roumanian immigrants are: those of a Roumanian who married a Jewess from Vaslui soon after their arrival in the United States in 1921; of five Roumanian men married to Hungarian women (one in New York, one in Youngstown, one in Detroit, two in Chicago); of a Roumanian man married to a "Sas"[2] from Transylvania and living in Cleveland; of a Roumanian woman married to a Serbian who also came from Banat and is now living in Chicago; of a Roumanian woman from Bukovina married to a Russian who migrated from a neighboring village in the Old Country, etc. Those cases help only to illustrate the types of intermarriage found among the Roumanians, but they do not measure statistically

[1] Exceptions are more often found among professional people, who, less conservative in their attitude towards marriage, can meet Americans on a footing of equality. Intermarriages between Roumanian men and American women are those of: a banker, a doctor, two diplomats in N. Y. C., a musician in Chicago, a lawyer in Indianapolis, and a diplomat in Washington; also that of a woman writer in N. Y., and probably some other cases of which the writer has no knowledge.

[2] See footnote 3, chapter iii, page 50.

the extent to which racial amalgamation is affecting the racial and cultural integrity of the Roumanian immigrant group, and is precipitating the assimilative process. The number of cases studied is too small to allow any sweeping statement. They prove, incidentally, that the choice of the Roumanians in regard to intermarriage is greatly determined by a certain amount of allegiance to the old traditions, as most of the Roumanian immigrants married to foreigners have chosen companions from among those who have at least one point in common with them—the country of origin.

Among the hundred Roumanian households of Chicago, ninety-two showed that their members have been married and eight were composed of unmarried men. Eighty-nine of the marriages were among immigrants of the first generation and three only among people of the second generation, though fifty-four marriages were contracted in the Old Country and thirty-eight in the United States. Among the ninety-two marriages only three were intermarriages, and all three were cases of Roumanian immigrants of the first generation married to first generation immigrants coming from the same province but being of different race. In all three cases, as well as all those mentioned above, the families have kept a strong contact with the life of the Roumanian group. The tendency, however, among the children and between parents and children is to speak English because of the difficulty of the children in endeavoring to learn the paternal and maternal language at home, besides the English taught in the schools.

It has been impossible to estimate to what extent intermarriage has affected the Roumanian group by taking from it men and women who have forsaken their national heritage in order to adopt the mores of either the American people or of the ethnic group into which they married. This study would have entailed quite a lengthy investigation into the

marital relations of immigrant Germans born in Transylvania, Bukovina or Besarabia, of Hungarians, Serbians, Greeks or Russians, with whom the former Roumanian-Transylvanian and Roumanian-Macedonian immigrants were in contact in the country of emigration or whose customs and traditions they knew, because they lived for many years in the same environment. It is also difficult to gauge the results of intermarriage among the second generation, because few of them have as yet reached the marital age. But if conclusions may be drawn from the three marriages of the second generation among the hundred Roumanian households of Chicago and from the marriages which were reported in the Roumanian daily *America* during the course of two years (only thirteen for the period of January, 1927 to December, 1928), it might be permissible to state, with due caution, that the tendency among the native-born of Roumanian parentage is to marry among themselves rather than resort to alliances with native-born people from other ethnic stocks. But this tendency, based merely upon the evidence in the daily *America,* should not be unduly stressed. This is not because the reliability of the information given by this paper might be questioned, but chiefly because there are many more marriages among the Roumanian immigrants of either the first or second generation, which receive no publicity partly for reasons of expense. The records kept by the Greek Catholic or the Greek Orthodox priests show that there are a great many more marriages than figure in the newspapers. The Greek Catholic priest in Trenton and Roebling, N. J.,[1] consecrated six weddings throughout the year 1927 and eight in 1928. The records of the Greek Catholic churches in Cleveland [2] show

[1] All of the 145 Roumanian families in Trenton, totalling 850 people, belong to the Greek Catholic Church. They had all come from the village of Satmar, which is surrounded by the Roman Catholic Hungarians.

[2] Cleveland has Roumanians who belong to the Greek Orthodox Church, the Greek Catholic Church, and the Baptist Church, without referring to the Roumanian Jews.

five for the year 1927 and six for the year 1928; while the Greek Orthodox Church registered seven and nine for the years 1927 and 1928; and the Roumanian Baptist Church one and two for the same years. The Greek Orthodox Church in Chicago recorded ten in 1927 and nine in 1928. These few illustrations prove that the question of the number of marriages among the Roumanians, or of the number of intermarriages between Roumanians of the first generation and other nationalities of immigrants, or between the second generation of Roumanians born in the United States and people belonging to either the American or foreign stocks, needs special consideration and cannot be treated adequately in the present discussion. There are two reasons for this. There has been no adequate collection of such data as are available, and few of the second generation have, as yet, reached the marital age. In the families where intermarriage occurred the process of assimilation has been precipitated. Generally one of the parents yields to the cultural influence of the other. But the children of a marriage of two foreign-born parents of different ethnic stocks, faced with the problem of learning two languages unused in their community, use the English taught in their schools, and consequently through their thinking processes and their medium of expression they are rapidly becoming assimilated into the new environment.

From the consideration of these cases the general conclusion to be drawn is that for the Roumanian immigrants the process of economic and cultural assimilation is well under way. In regard to their ethnic assimilation, it is necessary to wait for a much longer period to allow the American-born children and adolescents to grow and to marry before we can venture to predict results.

CHAPTER XI

Conclusions

This study of the Roumanians in the United States has been an attempt to present the different stages of assimilation during their short sojourn here, and to discover the steps in the process of assimilation and the criteria whereby it can be judged. It was pointed out that the complete adjustment of the immigrant to his new environment is threefold, economic, cultural, and ethnic, the latter not necessarily a condition *sine qua non* of the assimilative process, but greatly hastening it whenever present. This process takes a considerable time to achieve satisfactory results, and as the study could not be extended beyond two generations its incompleteness is obvious. However, the facts collected lead to the general conclusion that the Roumanians[1] of non-Jewish faith are for the most part assimilable. They have already proved that economically they are not a heavy burden to the community, as they try as much as possible to take care of their dependent cases through their mutual aid societies or by personal benevolence. Practically all are able to balance their family budgets. Some of them have even secured a degree of economic prosperity, which discloses both ability to meet the exigencies of higher standards of living and tenacious perseverance in their work. Even the less successful ones have managed to become self-supporting and to maintain a standard of living which, if it does not always compare favorably with that of

[1] We are referring here only to the non-Jewish Roumanians.

Americans, still shows a great deal of progress as compared to the simplicity or poverty of the life of the Roumanian peasant.

Culturally the Roumanian immigrants have made considerable progress. The building-up of their beneficial and cultural societies, the steady growth of their group as an organized ethnic unit with its churches, its parochial schools, and its club life for the education of young and old, the personal modifications in old habits and customs characteristic of the majority, the participation on the part of a constantly growing number in the economic, social and political life of the American community, are but illustrations of the strides that the Roumanians have taken in passing from a group of unorganized folk into a socially united ethnic unit, better equipped to understand the American environment through its collective efforts and achievements in the process of adaptation. Incidentally each Roumanian colony evolves according to the individual development of its members, because every progressive individual develops leadership and promotes the advancement of his group. Thus the younger immigrants of the first generation, who have had the advantage of American education, contribute to their group and indirectly to all the Roumanians in the United States the benefit of their studies and experience. The young professional men, teachers, lawyers, doctors, and engineers, who are coming from the rank and file of the sturdy Roumanians, are helping, through their enlightened leadership, to advance their own group and to lead it to realize the advantages of the American environment, without in the least undermining the sentimental attachment of the Roumanians to their country of origin. The fact that a great number of parents are willing to sacrifice their own pleasure and are working hard to secure the means of putting their sons and daughters through high school or college speaks favorably, if not of

their own cultural progress, at least of a keen appreciation of the benefits of higher learning for their own offspring.

As to their ethnic assimilation through amalgamation, it has been explained that, in view of the short span of years during which the Roumanian immigrants and their families have lived in the United States, it is impossible to tell what the results will be, for very few of the children have reached the marital age. The few endogamic marriages contracted between members of the second generation are not significant enough to draw definite conclusions, except that they disclose a tendency among the native-born Roumanians to marry within their own ethnic group. The Roumanian-Macedonians are so strongly against intermarriage that, in view of the shortage of Macedonian women in their midst, they bring their fiancées from their native villages, confident in the choice of their relatives at home and of the good reputation of the young girl. (See *Curierul American,* Anul, V, no. 7, 8, 9, 1928.) So far, however, the endogamic marriage has not arrested or undermined the process of assimilation, because the community of education and of environment are strong enough to further the modification of the immigrant traits transmitted by the parents which are constantly being transformed and modified under the pressure of the environment. How long it would take the Roumanians completely to assimilate themselves with the Americans without losing the memory of their national origin, how strongly endogamy would persist or intermarriage become entrenched in their midst, precipitating the effect and process of assimilation, are questions that belong to intellectual speculation and problems that only the future will solve.

It might be of great interest to study in the future the extent of intermarriage among the Roumanians, the Transylvanians and the Roumanian-Macedonians, and to see what effect the new American environment has had upon the racial

amalgamation of different immigrants. For centuries they have lived in the midst of heterogeneous elements in their native villages, strongly resisting assimilation by a stubborn holding to their cultural heritage, their language, their traditions, and their folkways, opposing intermarriage to the extent of considering any foreigner brought into the group through marriage as a heathen or an outcast.[1]

The fact remains, however, that the Roumanian immigrants are well under way in their process of adjustment, despite the fact that many of them, under the spell of the rapid growth of their national consciousness, think that America is a country of different ethnic groups, among whom economic prosperity, cultural achievement, and success greatly depend upon the strength of the organization of each group and upon its power to obtain politically the satisfaction of its claims. Some might even object to the idea of a gradual merging of their ethnic personality in the American nationality out of an excess of patriotism for or emotional attachment to Roumania, partly perhaps because the process of assimilation, under environmental pressure, is not always a conscious one.

But for the sociologist and others who seek the truth in facts, the gradual adaptation of the Roumanians is a sociological phenomenon, of which there is no doubt. To those who might challenge it, no better reply can be given than to invite them to undertake a more detailed study of the Roumanians, in order to check the observations herewith presented, which, needless to add, are far from covering every phase in the process of assimilation.

From the standpoint of those interested in the influence of the environment upon immigrants, the study of the Rou-

[1] See Teodorescu, G. D., "Poesii populare române", Bucureşti, 1885.

manians is but a mere introduction to many others, which, when the accumulation and repetition of facts make it possible, we hope will throw some light upon the as yet unsolved problem of the assimilative process.

CHAPTER XII

Appendix

I. A STUDY OF A HUNDRED ROUMANIAN FAMILIES IN CHICAGO [1]

In so large and complex a city as Chicago, where many other ethnic groups, such as Poles, Hungarians, Greeks, Italians, Serbians, Czecho-Slovakians, Germans, etc., so far overshadow them, the Roumanians are almost lost. Only such close, personal investigation as that made by one engaged in social research, reveals them as a separate ethnic group.

The actual fact-finding survey of the one hundred Roumanian families in Chicago was preceded by a preliminary investigation which included:

1. Personal interviews with 35 leaders of the Roumanian Jewish and Roumanian groups, of social organizations, of private and public institutions interested in immigrants as well as with other individuals who came in contact with the Roumanian community.
2. A home-to-home survey of the district known by the Roumanians as the "Fullerton-Clybourn" settlement, this being the district most thickly populated by Rou-

[1] This chapter is an abridgment of the "Roumanians in Chicago", a paper presented on September 1, 1927, to the Department of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago, upon completion of two summer Courses on Immigration and Social Research under Professor J. Steiner and Dean Edith Abbott. See: chapter i, p. 6, footnote 3.) Though Cleveland is considered the intellectual centre of the Roumanian colonies, and Detroit has the largest Roumanian settlement, Chicago has been studied as a fairly representative Roumanian colony, which has gone through a slow but steady growth.

manians, in order to determine (a) whether the Roumanian element was numerically superior to the other national groups in the neighborhood; (b) whether the families in the district were good representative samples of all the Roumanian settlers in the city; (c) what were the general marital conditions prevailing in the Roumanian household.

This canvass covered nine blocks, bounded on the east by Southport Avenue, on the north by Fullerton Avenue, on the slope of the southwest side by Clybourn Avenue, and on the south side by Webster Avenue. The data recorded were confined to the nationality of the people, the number of adult or minor persons, and the marital condition of the adult population.

3. The study of ten families taken at random from the files of a real-estate man (for the purpose of trying out the adequacy of the schedules).

This path-finding survey disclosed the following facts:

1. That the Roumanians who came to Chicago belonged to two different racial elements, the Gentiles and the Jews, the former having emigrated from Banat, Transylvania, Bukovina, at the time when those provinces were under Austro-Hungarian rule, and the latter from the Old Kingdom (Roumania prior to the war).
2. That the so-called Roumanian gypsies of Chicago, at least those established in South Halstead Street and engaged in fortune-telling, are not natives of Roumania but of Serbia.[1]
3. That the two racial groups, Gentiles and Jews, were total strangers to each other, not on account of racial

[1] Despite the fact that the four mind-readers who were visited, were able to express themselves in the vernacular of seven languages, they could not speak Roumanian.

discrimination, but because of the differences in cultural background, which determined their occupations and their modes of living. The Gentiles, originally peasants, centered in the various industrial sections of the city. The Jews, primarily a trading group, engaged more especially in commercial enterprises, and lived in either commercial or residential sections, centered mostly around Douglas Park.

4. That the " Fullerton-Clybourn " neighborhood, though thickly populated by Roumanian Gentiles, was rather a cosmopolitan district, where 14 nationalities were represented, totaling 608 families or 2,279 persons—1310 adults and 969 young people under twenty-one years of age. The Roumanians counted 126 families, with 403 adults and 120 persons under twenty-one years of age, or nearly one minor per family. They ranked second in the neighborhood's population with a percentage of 18.5%, the Poles first with 42.45%, and the Germans third with 16.8%.
5. That the Roumanian Gentiles, who have acquired an economic independence, tended to move out from the industrial district into residential sections. These facts led to the conviction that a study of 100 Roumanian Gentile families taken at random would reveal facts more representative of the Roumanian population in the city.

SETTLEMENTS

The Roumanians of Chicago have settled, in more or less compact neighborhoods, in three different districts, though they are sparsely scattered throughout the 35 wards of the city.[1]

[1] According to the 1920 Census figures, the wards: 34, 10, 20, 15, 13, 11, 24, have the largest Roumanian population; 876, 434, 472, 387, 221, respectively. See *U. S. Census*, 1920, vol. iii, pp. 274-276.

1. The first district is in the north, bounded on the east by North Clark Avenue, between 57th and 60th streets, on the north by Peterson Avenue, on the west by Ravenswood, and on the south by Cemetery Drive. This neighborhood is in the vicinity of Rosehill Cemetery and it is usually known among the Roumanians as the "Greenhouse" because of the opportunities for employment in the greenhouses, which were numerous in this section between 1900-1910. At present the district seems to be developing into a residential neighborhood, on account of its proximity to the lake shore. Property is going up in value, as beautiful up-to-date apartments have replaced the wooden shacks where the first Roumanians found a shelter, attracted by cheap rents and an open-air occupation. But few, if any, of the Roumanians availed themselves of the opportunity to buy cheap lots or inexpensive homes. "Greenhouse" was considered by the early settlers as the least progressive neighborhood. It is still held in discredit by the others on account of the low wages received by gardeners and the scarcity of employment. For this reason there are at present only a few Roumanians in this district, though from 1900-1907 it was the common meeting place of the early settlers.

2. The second district, the "Fullerton-Clybourn", has absorbed most of the Greenhouse settlers, on account of its proximity to the Deering Harvester Company and the North Western Terracotta factories. At present Greenview Street, High Street and the east side of Southport, as well as Clybourn, seem to be the preference of the Roumanians. One easily finds three or four houses, one after the other, where from six to twelve Roumanian families live. This neighborhood still enjoys the distinction of being the center of the Roumanian community life in Chicago, as it includes the church, the parochial school and the church club, "Coliba".

3. The third district is in the southern part of the city.

It can scarcely be described as a Roumanian neighborhood because the families are widely scattered in this section, which is bounded by S. Racine and S. Webster Avenues on the east and west, and 43rd Street and 51st Street on the north and south. There are from two to five families in nearly every street, chiefly Roumanians from Bukovina. The stockyards, with their opportunity for steady employment, appealed more to the Bukovinians than to the peasants from Banat.

Thus regional allegiance, habit, and employment bind the Roumanian worker to a neighborhood, irrespective of the shifting of the other ethnic groups. Economic prosperity, however, tends to change the conservative tendencies of the Roumanian immigrants by giving rise to a migratory movement away from the Fullerton and South districts to the west, northwest, and north, where new residential sections are opening.

ROUMANIAN IMMIGRANTS IN CHICAGO

The Roumanian population in Chicago, according to the rough estimation of the leaders, amounts to 10,000 mostly from the province of Banat, with a few from Bukovina, Transylvania and the Old Kingdom, and 8,000 Roumanian Jews who have emigrated only from the Old Kingdom. Those figures are far from being accurate and are misleading if one compares them with reliable enumerations. According to the 14th census of the United States there are 5,137 [1] foreign-born who have declared Roumania as their country of birth or the country of their last permanent residence. The mother-tongue inquiry shows only 2,228 [2] for-

[1] This number includes the Roumanian Jews and a few other ethnic groups migrating from Roumania. See *United States Census*, vol. xi, 1920, p. 891.

[2] *United States Census*, 1920, vol. ii, p. 1007.

eign-born and 1,001 native-born of Roumanian parentage, or a total of 3,229 Roumanians. This number seems too low, even if it is exclusive of the Roumanian Jews, who might have declared Yiddish as their mother tongue. Estimates based on 1914 figures bring the number of the Roumanians to either 11,788 or 11,644.[1] These numerical divergencies are misleading since they do not indicate the racial composition of the Roumanian immigrants and the provinces from which they have come. However, it must be borne in mind that the major part of the Roumanian Gentile population is from the Transcarpathian provinces, whereas the Jewish Roumanian population comes from the Old Kingdom. The Roumanian population in Chicago, according to official data, has increased from 287 people in 1900 to 5,137 in 1920.[2] The primary motives which have impelled the Roumanians to migrate from the provinces of Transylvania, Bukovina, etc. have been undoubtedly reenforced by economic circumstances, as is disclosed by the results of the investigation. Of the 189 adult Roumanian settlers from the 100 studied households, 83 have given as the direct motive of their emigration, "poverty and desire to better their economic conditions." To this number should be added the 77 adults who at the time of their arrival declared themselves as accompanying their husbands or their parents, but whose direct motive for emigration was also economic pressure. Undoubtedly psychological factors, such as discontent with the systematic Magyarization of the Roumanians in Hungary, limited educational facilities, and the restricted rights to the franchise, need not be overlooked. Mr. J. M. Cabot writes: "We must realize the shocking lack of educational

[1] Estimate of the Chicago Chamber of Commerce.

[2] *United States Census*, 1920, vol. ii, p. 857. These figures include the Roumanian Jews as well as all other nationalities migrating from Roumania.

facilities with which the Roumanians were confronted. The primary schools were entirely inadequate and the Roumanians had but five Gymnasia in all Hungary." [1] "Only 6% of the people on an average could vote, and, not content with this, the Magyars, in 1894, introduced a special franchise for Transylvania, by which 3.2% of the people could vote." [2] But these are contributory causes to emigration. The people who left were those who, dissatisfied with conditions, had the courage to break away from family ties and old habits, led by the vision of a better life, through the gradual development of the dormant potentialities lying in every individual. What Emily Greene Balch wrote in 1906 about the Slovak immigrants can be applied to the Roumanians as well: "Here, apart from purely natural causes, the main selecting traits would seem to be energy, strength and trustworthiness." [3] Once the first Roumanians left their villages, the others kept adding to the stream of immigration, stimulated to imitate the pioneers by information and encouragement received from their neighbors. Usually co-villagers met in the New World and formed the nuclei of the later ethnic groups, thanks to the Old Country ties of community of language, ideas, and customs. The majority of the Roumanian Gentiles of Chicago are drawn from two villages: Comnosh and San Nikolas in Banat, but there are also some from Bukovina and a few from the Old Kingdom. Despite the fact that the early Roumanian population in Chicago was in the main composed of men, in the summer of 1927 the single men were in a minority, only twenty single men out of 102, and most of the families had settled definitely. The six married men whose families are in Rou-

[1] J. Moors Cabot, *The Racial Conflict in Transylvania*, Boston, 1926, p. 64.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[3] Emily Green Balch, "Slav Emigration at Its Source," *In Charities*, 1906, p. 833.

mania are contemplating a return home, as are also twelve single men and widowed women. Sixty-three family-heads out of one hundred have declared that they intend to become permanent residents in this country. The evasive answers of 19 families as to their future plans can be easily interpreted as an eventual residence in this country, for their children are educated in American schools and have adapted themselves to the American life.

Thus the Roumanians have gradually changed from a temporary immigrant group to permanent settlers. During the early years of the immigration every one came here with the idea of "piling up" enough money for a triumphant return home. But in the course of years the desire for making money forced the Roumanian immigrants to postpone this event until the war made it impossible. Meanwhile psychological forces which were at work offset the influence of the old home ties. The new generation, brought up to American ideals, necessarily cannot feel the spell of the Old Country. Environment has given rise, even in the older generation, to new habits. Unconscious of the changes which have taken place within themselves in the course of twenty years, those who attempted to return "for good" to the Old Country, immediately after the War, soon discovered that they could not readapt themselves to the native village ways and that they longed to return to the New World. They left the Old Country once more, this time in order to settle permanently in their adopted home.

MARITAL CONDITIONS

One hundred families visited included 291 persons, of whom 62.9% have been married, 2.7% are single and 34.4% are under twenty-one years of age and live with their parents. Among the 183 married people there are 89 married men, 83 married women, 3 widowers, 6 widows, and 2

divorced men. Only 6 of the 89 married men had their wives and children in the Old Country. Of the 100 dwellings visited, 89 are occupied by families and 11 by men alone (married, divorced, or spouse deceased). There are 38 families who have only one child, 23 have two children, 9 have three, and only 4 have four children or more. This shows an average of one child per family. The small number of children among the Roumanians in Chicago is a peculiar characteristic of the peasants from Banat, even in the Old Country, because, unlike the other Roumanian peasants, they resort to birth control.

AGE

The data of the investigation show that the 102 adult male immigrants have an average age of 44 years in a range of years from 20 to 65. The women range from 15 to 60 years and their average is 38 years. The difference between the average age of the men and that of the women is due to the fact that the Roumanian men prefer to marry girls younger than themselves, the prevailing belief being that women mature more rapidly than men and that with years the difference tends to disappear. The group under 21 years of age comprises 55 boys and 45 girls, whose ages run from below 5 to 20 years, inclusive. The average age of the boys is 14 years and 7 months, and that of the girls 14 years and 8 months. The minor population born in the United States totals 82 (45 boys and 37 girls), the remaining 18 children (10 boys and 8 girls) being born in Banat. These figures show that even among the young generation the males are outnumbering the females, the ratio being 122 boys to 100 girls.

OCCUPATIONS

The Roumanians of Chicago are not absorbed in one single industry, as in Detroit or in Gary, but are engaged in various occupations.

Men.—From the 102 men included in the 100 households, 100 were gainfully employed and two were out of work, because of old age, and were cared for by their children. Those employed were engaged in 31 varieties of occupation,[1] showing a progressive change in occupation since the time of their arrival, when the group of 102 men was made up of 77 unskilled laborers, 17 skilled workers, one business man, two professional men, and five who had no occupation because they were under five years of age.

Women.—Of a total of 89 women, 62.7% are working outside the home, while 36.3% are engaged in caring for their homes and families. These women declared no occupation other than that of housekeeping, at the time of their arrival. Actually the women are chiefly engaged in the men's clothing industry, both at Hart, Schaffner & Marx and at Kuppenheimer's. There are 26 of them in this line of work, 11 do laundry work, 3 keep boarding houses, 3 are hotel managers, and 3 are engaged in beauty parlors. The latter occupation is a general favorite, though the remuneration does not much exceed the factory pay, especially if the women do piece work. But manicure, pedicure, and permanent waving have become stepping-stones to a self-constituted aristocracy of labor. They appeal more to the young generation, which is a little resentful of too heavy factory work. The young women, unhampered by the language barrier, have proved themselves proficient in this line of work, and one of them,

[1] One artist, two bakers, four barbers, one beauty parlor operator, one blacksmith, three in building trades, one business man, four carpenters, seventeen cement workers, three contractors, five day laborers, one electrician, ten factory workers, two furniture makers, one furrier, seven gardeners, one hotel keeper, three icemen, two janitors, one laundryman, two leather workers, nine mechanics, one worker in men's clothing, one painter, two pool-room operators, one real-estate man, one restaurant proprietor, one salesman, one store-keeper, three stockyard workers and eight truck drivers.

a woman only twenty-seven years of age, directs a series of eight barber shops and beauty parlors.

Children. — There is no child labor among the Roumanians, despite the fact that many immigrants have been criticized for driving their children to work prematurely. Though greed for money has been as keen and active among the Roumanians as among any other racial group, no child under 17 was found to be gainfully employed. Among the boys, between 16 and 21 years, only nine were engaged in lucrative occupations, as barbers, painters, janitors, mechanics or day-laborers. One of them is an associate contractor, working with his father. The eight working girls, between 16 and 21, are employed in the same industries as their mothers—laundry, clothing, and beauty parlors. Only one is a stenographer. On the whole, the Roumanian parents do not expect their children to engage early in work, especially if the youngsters show any inclination to higher learning. The parents are very anxious for their children to avail themselves of educational opportunities which have been denied to the elder generation.

WAGES

Men's Wages. — In the men's clothing industry the men earn $35.00 a week, while their weekly wages in factories vary from $30.00 to $45.00. The average wage for the 100 working men is $44.80 per week with a range from $25.00 to $100.00. These high wages are due chiefly to overtime work. Some of the men, especially the cement finishers, are working on an average of twelve hours a day, even on Sundays. As their wages vary from $0.90 to $1.10 per hour, their total weekly earnings are not exaggerated. Despite the seasonal fluctuations inherent in the building trades, the cement workers are able to secure steady work.

Women's Wages.—The wages of the women are lower in comparison with those of the men. They vary from less than $20.00 per week to $65.00; three women even get $100.00 per week. Their average wage is $25.85. The weekly earnings in the clothing industry are higher than those in the laundry, $25.00 as compared with $18.00, but the clothing industry, on account of its seasonal variation in output, is unable to provide the stability of employment which is found in laundry work. Were we to compare the yearly earnings of the laundry and clothing workers, by making due allowance for the lay-offs during the slack periods in the clothing industry, they would scarcely differ. Though laundry work is considered an inferior occupation to that of button-hole making, the women like it, because the "machines do the work" and also because it gives steady employment throughout the year.

Wages of Boys and Girls between 16 and 21 years old.—The wages of boys and girls vary between $20.00 and $45.00 per week. The average wage of both boys and girls is $26.50 per week.

Trade-Union Affiliations or Membership.—The total trade-union membership of the 173 gainfully employed Roumanians is only 38—about 22%. This small percentage is due to the fact that the majority of men are in non-unionized industries. The women's higher membership, 20 out of the 38, is a result not of their special interest in labor organizations but because of their employment in the men's clothing industry, which has labor agreements with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Exploitation.—The custom with the Roumanians, as with any other immigrant group, is to seek employment where other countrymen are already engaged. The newcomer benefits by the knowledge of the older employee, who initi-

ates him, in his own vernacular, into the secrets of the work, the handling of the machines, the safety rules, and the relationships with the other workers. In cement work, the clothing industry, and laundry work, the foreman is often a Roumanian who has risen from the workers' ranks, thanks to his perseverance and trustworthiness. But despite his privileged position there were no evidences that the foreman took advantage of the lack of experience of his fellow countrymen. None of the 173 working Roumanians is said to have been exploited. Only one loaned money to a relative, who returned to the Old Country without reimbursing him for the $1,000 borrowed. But this is a case of swindle rather than of exploitation.

LIVING CONDITIONS

Types of Houses, Overcrowding.—The houses in which the Roumanians live vary from the two- to four-room apartment houses of the tenement type to the up-to-date two- or three-family homes, and even to individual bungalows. But whether the building is dingy with soot or glistening with new paint, the Roumanian home generally presents uncrowded living conditions, which prevail even in the three boarding houses in which live from seven to thirteen people. The average number of rooms per household is 4.91. The average number of persons per household is 4.3. The ratio of the number of persons to the number of rooms in the households is 1.

Ownership. — The relative economic prosperity of the Roumanians is revealed by the type of homes in which they live and which they own. Of the total 100 families, 67 rent their homes, the rent varying from $5.00 for a single room to $80.00 for a comfortable apartment of five rooms; the average rent is $24.20 per household. The other 33 families own their homes, 17 of them being encumbered with first

mortgages. To these proprietors must be added 18 more, who though living in rented homes, own unencumbered land and property in Roumania. Thus the total number of proprietors is 51, or a little above half the total number of the heads of families. This ratio is fairly high, especially when one bears in mind the absence of financial resources on the part of these immigrants at the time of their arrival. It illustrates favorably their thriftiness and working endurance.

Ownership has a potent influence on the amount of comfort and luxury enjoyed by the Roumanians. Of the 33 proprietors, 28 have electric light, 27 bath-rooms, 22 steam heat, and 21 telephones. Tenants and owners have an equal number of victrolas, but among the former there are only six who own cars, while 19 cars, 7 pianos, and 2 radios are divided among the proprietors.

Cleanliness.—Seventy-nine homes were found to be kept orderly and very clean, 12 had medium standards, and 9 were below par.[1] In general, the Roumanian women are very good housekeepers and their standards of cleanliness are high, irrespective of the types of homes in which they live. The fact that 21 homes, or one-fifth of the total, are not up to standard is partly attributable to the number of single men who keep house alone. Five of these received the ranking of *b* and 5, *c*. However, 11 women also fall below par. Their excuse, that it is difficult to combine household duties with factory work, is invalidated by the fact that, among the 71 whose homes rank *a*, 36 are also working in factories.

LITERACY AND KNOWLEDGE OF ENGLISH

The two main factors which directly affect the ability of the immigrant to adapt himself to the new environment are: (1) literacy, or ability to write in any given language, and (2) the immigrant's ability to speak English. Taking into

[1] See chapter v, p. 83.

consideration from the number of persons studied only those over 10 years of age, as is usually done in the census computations, there are 42, or 17.2%, illiterates among the 264. The ratio of the illiteracy of men to women is 1 to 2. The 13 illiterate men represent 10% of the number of males over 10 years of age, while the 29 illiterate women represent 25.9% of the females over 10 years.

Among the 202 literates over 10 years of age, 63 can read and write only in Roumanian, 129 in both Roumanian and English, and 10 in three languages. These figures possibly depict the situation too favorably. Despite the fact that the illiteracy percentage is fairly small compared to the 35.0% given by the investigation of the Immigration Commission in 1909,[1] the educational achievements of these people are rather limited. Taking all the persons over seven years of age, there are only 6 people among 253 who have been or still are in High School. The remainder have attended the public schools, 105 in the Old Country and 100 in the United States, 42 being illiterate. The average school attendance does not exceed four years. Only two immigrants are graduates of the Roumanian University, but the young generation is availing itself of the opportunities offered here to pursue higher education while engaged in work. The children who are especially gifted and are graduating from the public school or are still in high school, contemplate going to college. On the whole, however, the bulk of the Roumanian immigrants has acquired only an elementary education.

Ability to Speak English. — There are few Roumanians who cannot speak English, only 32 among the total number of 244 persons over 10 years of age. English-speaking, however, has with the immigrant a broad meaning, covering all grades of conversation, from a mere smattering to a fluent expression. Though many understand English and

[1] *Report of Immigration Commission*, vol. i, 1911, p. 99.

use it daily, the language is far from perfect. The old generation can speak, with some ease, two or three languages, because of the many contacts in the Old Country with other national groups—Hungarians, Serbians, Germans, and Russians. Among the 244 persons over 10 years of age, 86.85% speak English and Roumanian; of these, 32 speak three languages and 20 understand four languages. The younger generation speaks only Roumanian and English and uses the latter more often than the Roumanian as an easier and richer mode of expression. It is interesting to note that 12 children can speak only English, which shows the growing tendency of the English language to permeate the Roumanian home, the blending of which into the community produces the "mental assimilation"[1] which is bound to come in the course of years.

CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship with the Roumanian immigrant is independent of his length of residence in the United States. Among the 189 foreign-born over 21 years of age, 185 have been in the United States for a period varying from 5 to 20 years. But only 42.3% have become naturalized, while another 9% have declared their intention to become American citizens and 48.60% are still aliens. In comparing the status of men with that of women we see that the men count 56 naturalizations, or a little more than one-half of their total. The women do not exceed one-fourth of their number. They have 70.1% aliens in their group, whereas the men have only 30%. Only 2 women have taken out their first papers in comparison with 15 among the 102 men. The general interest in the naturalization status is twice as great among men as among women. Despite this wide difference between the sexes, the fact remains that half of the Roumanian immi-

[1] Commons, J. R., *Races and Immigrants*, p. 21.

grants are passive with regard to citizenship, the direct causes of this apparent indifference being:

(a) The psychological forces playing upon the allegiance of the individual to the Old Country;
(b) The possibility of returning home;
(c) A cultural difficulty caused by the immigrants' inability to speak English or to meet the requirements of the literacy test. This is especially true of the older immigrants, who furnish the greatest number of illiterates.

Citizenship has, however, greatly stimulated participation in public affairs. The franchise is used equally by men and women voters; 50 out of the 56 naturalized men vote and 19 out of the 24 women. The Roumanian community is not numerically strong enough to assume an important place in the political life of the city. However, the younger people are becoming interested in public affairs and their votes are sought by both Republicans and Democrats in ward elections.

SOCIAL EVILS

The investigation of the 100 families shows only one case of family desertion by a drunkard father, whose children are under the care and legal guardianship of friends. According to the statement of the heads of social agencies and public institutions (Settlements, Juvenile Court, Boys' Court, Domestic Relations Court), there are no social evils among the Roumanians. However, a more careful study discloses a few cases of dependency, delinquency, and criminality.

Dependency.—The annual reports of the Chicago Juvenile Court for the years 1920-1927,[1] inclusive, show 17 dependent cases of Roumanians and 40 cases of mothers' pensions. This small number of charity-seekers is due to the fact that

[1] The report for 1928 was not out by February, 1929.

the Roumanians still resort to the old methods of personal contributions through the press whenever necessity demands. Dependency arising from family desertion by the father is difficult to ascertain. The data of the investigation show two cases of divorced men constantly brought to court for non-support. Going through 2,250 filed complaints at the Court of Domestic Relations for the six-month period January 1 to June 30, 1927, there were only three cases of non-support,[1] one against a Roumanian Jew and two against Roumanians married to Hungarians.

Delinquency.—As to the juvenile delinquents, there were 50 Roumanian children brought to the Juvenile Court for the years 1920-1927 inclusive, 39 boys and 11 girls. The total number of dependent and delinquent cases for this period is 83 Roumanians among a total of 42,517 or a ratio of 1 to 1,000. It has been impossible to read the records and get the fundamental causes of the children's delinquency. A mere technicality barred the way, since the dockets of the Juvenile Court do not record the nationality of the children. Those interested in some special racial group of delinquents must go through the files and pick out the names which might seem Polish, Slovakian, German or Roumanian. This not only involves a tedious task, but it is almost entirely guess-work. Many immigrants with long names have resorted to short cuts or to literary translations, which are completely irrelevant to the originals. Thus Petrovici or Petrescu has become Peterson, while Johnson might stand for Ionescu or Ioanitsiu and Miller for Morariu. The same difficulty is encountered at the Boys' Court, where the nationalities of the delinquents are not recorded.

Criminality. — The classification of crimes according to nationalities appears for the first time in the Annual Reports

[1] Complaints filed at court of Domestic Relations, nos. 373,365, 758,026, 758,364.

of the Chicago Police Department for 1915. Roumanians charged with felonies and misdemeanors appear in the 1916 Report, and the total number for the period 1916-1927, inclusive, comprises 219 charged with felonies and 1,691 with misdemeanors in a grand total of 192,904 felony cases and 1,701,547 misdemeanors. For the same period there were 59 Roumanians convicted of felonies in a grand total of 50,464 convictions or a little over one per 1,000, and 453 Roumanians convicted of misdemeanors in a grand total of 541,672—not even one per 1,000. As for the crimes of violence there were only two cases of manslaughter among the Roumanians for a total period of thirteen years, from 1915-1927 inclusive.

SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS

The Roumanians in Chicago have developed a great number of institutions around which centers their group life. Beneficial and cultural organizations, churches, parochial schools, and newspapers have contributed in strengthening their ethnic allegiance to the Old Culture and in helping them at the same time to understand their environment better.

The Church

There are two Roumanian churches in Chicago:

(a) The First Roumanian Baptist Church is on North Ashland Avenue. It has been given by the Baptist Board of Missions to the recently converted Roumanian congregation. The Roumanian Baptists of Chicago are in a significant minority. However, religious life has a vital interest for them, as not only are their ministers a well-trained group of people, but unhampered by financial preoccupations thanks to the subsidy received, they can devote all their energies to the needs of their parishioners.

(b) The Roumanian Greek Orthodox Church "Adormirea Maicei Domnului" (the Assumption of the Holy Virgin) is at the corner of Webster Avenue and Ward Street.

The candles burning in front of the holy icons, the long brocade robes of the priest, the heavy brass candelabra, and the Byzantine liturgy give to the church a mediæval atmosphere. A characteristic feature in the service of the Transcarpathian churches is the sadness of the hymns, which bring to memory the doleful tones of the "Doina" (a pastoral song).

The parish members do not exceed 150, because Roumanians have not been educated to church membership. They are generous donors, especially when they gather in larger numbers for great celebrations, such as Easter and Christmas. But as a whole they do not attend church regularly. The priest often has to officiate at mass for only 30 to 40 people. The younger women excuse themselves because of household duties, while the older ones hold to the Banat custom of "boiling" the Sunday dinner on Saturdays and of attending mass on Sundays. As to the men, only a few show a genuine interest in church life. The underlying cause for this general indifference is to be found in the lack of able leadership in the community and the Church.

For fifteen years, from 1900 to 1915, the Roumanians of Chicago had no church. Uncertain as to their return home, they did not consider building a church, and for baptismal ceremonies or funerals they went to the Russian and Serbian churches in the vicinity of the Fullerton-Clybourn district. About 1908 they secured the services of a priest from their own village and mass was celebrated for seven years, in the hall of a saloon kept by a Roumanian in Bosworth Street. The need of a church was felt strongly by all those who consider it the stronghold of group life and ethnic ideals. The

campaign for the church building started in 1910, but even when the church was erected, in 1915, it was encumbered with a mortgage of over $10,000. The enthusiasm of the people was kindled when, during the church inauguration, they paraded the streets in the paraphernalia of their national costumes, displaying the Roumanian and the American flags, with two bands leading the procession.

Soon after this the church history became the record of a series of misunderstandings and clashes of authority between the priests and the parishioners. The latter, church owners by force of circumstances and necessity, wished to control church affairs. The former, accustomed to the privileges of authority with which tradition invests them in the Old Country, considered the admission of the laity into church matters degrading. They objected to "receiving orders from their inferiors," because they failed to realize the difference between the passive attitude of the Old Country parishioners and the active interest of a congregation which feels responsible for the existence of the church that it has helped to build. The parishioners objected to "being ruled" by the "intelligentsia," and the relationship between them became tense. The priest was even accused of handling the finances of the church unscrupulously, because, insulted by the suspicion, he refused to account for the outlay of a $500 appropriation. The same priest, however, had raised most of the funds to build the church and he had been rewarded by the parishioners with a $500 gift.

Since 1923 the church has entered upon a new life, but the old wounds are not completely healed. However, the winning personality of the present priest, commanding the respect of the whole community, has succeeded in the course of his three years of ministry in awakening the dormant interest of the parishioners.

The men are evincing more interest in church affairs, be-

cause of the organization of a men's chorus and a more articulate participation in the government of the church. The women's section of the parish became an independent organization in May, 1927, and is contributing generously to the support of the church and the parish school. Despite this new interest, church life occupies only a second place in the activities of the community.

Some pessimists predict the death of this church, because of the rapid growth of an English-speaking generation to whom Roumanian will become a foreign language. The optimists, on the other hand, believe that the power of tradition will resist disintegration, as Roumanians will never consent to live or to die without the holy sacraments.

The Parochial School

The little school held on the upper floor of the " Coliba " can scarcely be designated by the name of parochial school. It consists of one class attended by twenty or twenty-five children, from a total registration of fifty. All ages, seven to fourteen, are represented, and the children are initiated into the beauty of the Roumanian language. The lessons consist in learning the religious service, in reading from the Roumanian Bible, and in memorizing the names of the Roumanian national heroes. Classes last from an hour to an hour and a half, and they are held after public school hours. Usually the summer sessions last from two to three hours.

Discipline is rather difficult to maintain. The priest, unaware of the American idea of self-government and self-control, deplores the seeming lack of respect for authority and old age on the part of the children. But thanks to his personality, which commands respect and affection, he succeeds in controlling this little group without resorting to corporal punishment, as some of his predecessors have done.

Only a few families take advantage of the school, many of them living at too great a distance. Somehow, however, the younger generation manages to read Roumanian and, because the spelling is phonetic and the letters used are Latin, the children who read English can read Roumanian easily.

The Roumanian Baptist school is like an American Sunday school. It is held on Sundays only, immediately before the regular church service.

Judged from the American point of view, the Roumanian parochial school does not deserve criticism as an obstacle to assimilation, "segregating the children of the foreign-born."[1] It is not a substitute for the public school. It is only trying to span the gap between the native-born generation and the foreign-born parents. By learning the facts of Roumanian history the child becomes proud of his ancestry and feels that he has the right to compete on equal footing with American boys and girls in their activities, and, unhampered by any inferiority complex, he grows into a better American citizen.

SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CLUBS

The Roumanians in Chicago have nine social organizations or clubs.

(1) The *Sperantsa* (Hope) is the oldest beneficial and cultural organization of the Roumanians. It was started in 1907 by an eminent intellectual from the Old Kingdom who was sympathetic with the difficulties encountered by his fellow countrymen in trying to take care of the cases of dependency occurring from either death or accident. The organization was continued by leaders arising from the ranks of the workers, men of high standing in the community. The lodge has gone through periods of success and decline, according to the personality of its leaders. It made

[1] Ross, E. A., *The Old World in the New*, p. 253.

a great step toward strengthening its organization by affiliating, in 1923, with the Union of the Roumanian Societies in America.

The *Sperantsa* pays a death benefit of either $250, $500, $750, or $1000, according to the policy taken, the fees varying in proportion to the age scale. It also provides for a sick benefit of $7 per week during the whole period of sickness. Its membership is 220.

Aside from these mutual-help activities, the *Sperantsa* is fostering the promotion of culture by giving lectures, talks, and fêtes. It has also a library of 500 Roumanian books, representing the classics of the Roumanian literature—M. Eminescu, V. Alexandri, Cojbuc, Odobescu, Delavrancea, Goga, etc.—and some English books, the gift of Mr. W. F. Brewster, former Minister of the United States to Roumania. The society has contributed funds to the support of the church and the parochial school.

(2) The *Clubul Imigrantul* (the Immigrant's Club) is another cultural and beneficial organization. It was organized in 1909, and has recently joined the Union. It has a membership of 160 persons.

(3) The *Clubul Tineretului* (the Club of the Youth) started in 1916, was reorganized in 1920 and has changed its name to that of *Clubul Social-Politic Independentsa* (the Social and Political Club: Independence). It counts twenty-eight members, chiefly among the younger men, and aims at educating the younger generation to meet its civic responsibilities. Quite independent of any political affiliation, it has adopted the policy of presenting to the Roumanian group the nominated candidates of either the Republican or the Democratic parties. The club's cultural activities throughout the winter include talks, discussions, addresses, and plays given by amateur players. The club members support the Roumanian baseball team, which is made up of high school boys.

(4) The *Reuniunea Femeilor Romane Credința* (the Association of Roumanian Women Faith), started in 1916, to maintain the interest of the women in church affairs. The forty women who constitute the membership have already assumed heavy responsibilities. They have paid $5,000 to the parish, to cover the church's debts, they keep the church in good order by redecorating it when it is deemed necessary, and they provide for the decorations of the church and the brocade robes of the priest.

Their monthly meetings are a perfect illustration of parliamentary procedure, which proves that "the school of life" in America has been a profitable experience to them.

Under the able leadership of its president the association has gained its independence by breaking away from the "Parish" and by securing a charter and a seal.

(5) The *Filiala Ligei* (a Branch of the former League) is also a cultural and beneficial society, which will undoubtedly join forces with the *Sperantsa,* since the Union and the League have merged.[1] At present it has only twenty-four members.

(6) The *Clubul Cetațenilor Romani Americani* (the Club of the Roumanian American Citizens), reorganized in 1918, was a mixed Gentile and Jewish Roumanian association, organized in 1914 in an effort to gain political recognition in the city. However, the attempt proved a failure as there was no cohesion between the two racial groups. After the War the club was revived, and it has at present 400 members, recruited among Gentiles only. The club educates the Roumanian American citizens in their rights and duties. At present it favors the Republican Party, and during the last city elections was influential in obtaining Roumanian votes for Mayor Thompson.

[1] See Roumanian daily *America,* no. 203, August 29, 1927.

(7) The *Falnicul Zarand Roman* is a small club of twelve members, composed of the ex-mountaineers of Northern Transylvania known as the "Moții," a brave group of people who have resisted invasion and Magyarization by retiring to the mountains, where they have lived the most rudimentary life, almost approaching that of the cave-men.

(8) The Club of the bi-monthly paper *Libertatea,* started in 1914, numbers six hundred and eighty members, but its activities are limited to financial campaigns for the support of the paper.

(9) The *Clubul Muncitorilor* (the Roumanian Workers' Club) has only twenty-eight members, men and women, but its presence in the Roumanian community gives rise to a great deal of criticism and fear because of its socialistic views. Organized in 1914, the Club has kept a constant membership and has succeeded in attracting the most progressive workers, those who are seeking both economic prosperity and greater opportunities for higher learning.

The Workers' Club meets regularly every Tuesday night in the Serbian Socialists' headquarters, at 2250 Clybourn Avenue. Besides its regular business meeting, the Club carries on a series of lectures on labor problems, industrial democracy, the passing of capitalism, etc. Students and intellectuals are welcome to address the "comrades" and to discuss matters with them. Two or three times a year the Club gives amateur dramatic performances, the subjects of which are closely connected with the problems which confront the workers. The last play was "Condemned to Death," the work of a German, and had been translated into Roumanian by a comrade from Detroit.

The Workers' Club is affiliated with the Cultural Association of the Roumanian Workers, a small organization totaling only 130 members, with headquarters in Detroit.[1] Its

[1] See chapter vi, p. 104.

temporary affiliation with the radical workers discredited the Workers' Club in the eyes of the Roumanian community, which still identifies it with the "reds" or "bolshevists." However, this reputation is undeserved, as the "comrades" are a most peace-loving and law-abiding group of workers, who are seeking not only "the emancipation of the working man from economic slavery," as one puts it in realistic terms, but also, and perhaps chiefly, for adult education along lines of occupational interests.

The "Comrades" have severed their connection with the Church. They continue, however, to reproach the priest for refusing them the use of the Church Hall, not realizing that their atheism, more than their seeming radicalism, has dictated the attitude of the Church in its policy of exclusion. In spite of this, the priest is reported to have granted to the "Comrades" the use of the "Coliba" (the Church Hall) for a benefit performance, the proceeds of which were to be sent to the famine-stricken Russians. Though this event happened in 1919 it is still fresh in the memory of the "Comrades," who recall even the excuse given by the priest: "As a Roumanian and a citizen respecting the laws of this country I ought to refuse you the use of the Hall. But as a Christian, I feel bound to give it to you, for the humanitarian goal you have in view."

Despite the divergencies in scope and activities, there is no friction among the other social organizations of the Roumanians, except for the ostracism of the "Comrades." In 1921 they set up a Council of Social Agencies, in order to avoid competition in their financial campaigns. Ever since then the "Parish" has held its collection on Christmas day; the *Libertatea,* on Saint George's day, April 23; the *Sperantsa,* at Easter; the *Independentsa,* on Whitsunday; the *Immigrant,* on the Fourth of July; the "Women's-associa-

tion Faith," on August 15; and the Workers' Club on Labor Day.

THE PRESS

Aside from these social organizations which bind the Roumanians of Chicago into a group life, the greatest blending force among them and between them and the community at large is the Roumanian press. It is through this medium that the Roumanians are getting the New World's point of view, together with knowledge of the events at home. Through it they are coming to understand this country better, because laws pertaining to immigration, child labor, public hygiene, etc., are carefully explained; and national holidays, such as the Fourth of July, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Soldiers' Day, etc. receive special consideration. Were it not for the existence of the Roumanian press, some of the immigrants would have felt totally cut off from the community life of this country, as many are unable to read the American newspapers because the language and colloquialisms are difficult to understand. Thus the Roumanian press remains at present the chief influence through which the limited horizon of the Roumanian group is broadened to include glimpses of American life and international affairs, events from the Old Country and the activities of other Roumanian communities settled in the United States and Canada. In order to fulfil its aim, it had to adapt the Roumanian literary language to the vernacular [1] of the people from Banat and Transylvania.

There is only one Roumanian paper printed in Chicago, the *Libertatea*,[2] but the *America* and the *Deșteptarea* have a large circulation.

[1] See Park, R. E., *The Immigrant Press and Its Control*, p. 71.

[2] The *Libertatea* (Freedom) is a semi-monthly which attempts a summary of current events. Lack of financial support accounts for its appearance at irregular intervals. It has a circulation of about 1,000, though the paper claims, apparently for advertising purposes, to reach 50,000 people.

RECREATIONAL AND SOCIAL CONTACTS

Recreation

After the hard labor of the day the single Roumanian, in order to satisfy his impulse for gregarious life, either goes to the pool-room to watch the others play and hear the gossip, or joins a card party in the church hall. The married people often cluster on the threshold of a house and exchange with neighbors the news of the day or gather in a friend's house to read the paper, discuss wages, decide who should enter the Ministerial Council in Roumania, or enjoy a glass of home-made wine or beer. Generally the women listen to the men, but they also exchange their troubles or contribute to the conversation when they have "something to say," though the men still cling to their prerogative of being the "superior sex." Whether these gatherings are casual or prearranged, they are never short of wits or dry. The Roumanian does not consider himself a law-breaker when he makes his own wine, beer or the "tsuica" (an alcoholic beverage produced by the fermentation of plums and considered the national drink of the Roumanians). Like the Italian or the Greek, he cannot enjoy a meal without a glass of wine. He treats his friends and even a casual visitor to the home-made beverage, but drinking is not carried on outside the home.

Winter is the propitious season for indoor recreational activities, and every Sunday, from September to May, the Roumanians dance in the "Coliba," for they have no taboos for Sunday. The band is usually made up of Roumanian musicians, but the saxophone has replaced the violin and the cymbal, and instead of the old melodious tunes of the peasant or gypsy fiddlers of the native village, the young people dance to the metallic rhythm of the jazz. The "shimmy" and the "black bottom" are accelerating the "shaking off" of old traits. But dancing: the "Hora" (national dance in circles), the "Banateana" (dance from Banat), the "Arde-

leanca" (Transylvanian dance), etc. are still in vogue, not only because they are the old favorites of the parents, but also because they offer to the young people the opportunity to wear the national costume.

The average Roumanian rarely attends an English theatrical performance, the language being difficult for him. But he enjoys the productions given in Roumanian, professional or amateur, which are contributing much to the artistic and moral recreation of the Roumanians, by presenting in the vernacular plays in which American and Roumanian ideals are closely interwoven.

Aside from the group recreation provided by the different clubs, the moving pictures offer a daily diversion, especially for the younger people. The boys have a baseball team at a nearby settlement, but athletics and the passion for ball games have not displaced the interest in dancing and intergroup recreation. The latter is given preference, for it allows all of the family, group-ups and babies, to spend their leisure time together. Moreover, group recreation is the best way of breaking down the barriers of regionalism, the clannishness of the Banatians, the Transylvanians and the Bukovinians, who are always inclined to think that their own folk are better than others and tend, consequently, in their everyday life, to mingle only with their co-villagers. Play brings old and young together, people from Banat, Bukovina, or Transylvania scattered throughout the city. By making them participate in the same round of pleasurable occupations and pastimes, it tends to wear off the superficial geographic differences and to strengthen the unity of the group.

Social Contacts with the Community at Large

The Roumanains are on the whole a socially-minded people. But their inability to speak English has rendered them diffident and the apparent reserve of the Anglo-Saxon

has stifled any impulse to mingle. Even for the daily needs of life, whenever it is possible, they depend upon their own compatriots, barbers, grocers, soda-parlor or coffee-house keepers who are in the neighborhood. Their contacts with the community at large are rather limited. There are no interracial activities, despite the fact that the Roumanians live in cosmopolitan sections. Each immigrant group is intent upon its own development. There is no intermingling except in the case of personal friends.

The life of the Roumanian immigrant has been little affected by social agencies. The United Charities have dealt occasionally with them. The Immigrant Protective League has been in closer touch with them, having extended its services to one hundred Roumanians during the years of 1926-1928, inclusive. Christopher House, a settlement in the Fullerton-Clybourn district, has ten Roumanian children in its nursery, twelve boys in an athletic club, and about ten girls participating in the girls' activities. But no contacts have been made with the mothers of these children.

The public school is the only American institution which breaks effectively through the walls of segregation. It draws together the children of different racial groups and helps to bridge the gap between the immigrant group and the community at large.

The Roumanians are, as yet, unprepared to assume any official responsibility in public life. For this reason political leadership has not developed beyond their immediate needs.

The only participation which they have had in community affairs was during the War. Their representative worked in close collaboration with the Association of the Foreign Born American Citizens for the Third Liberty Loan campaign. They joined the American Red Cross during the war, but there is no way of ascertaining the exact amount of their contribution. There are also a few who enlisted in the army,

but their number is lost in the huge contribution of all the other racial groups.

Recently, during the visit of Her Majesty the Queen of Roumania, the Roumanians have had some public recognition, but they themselves need to develop ability to participate effectively in the affairs of the community.

CONCLUSION

The dominant idea emerging from this survey is that during the short span of twenty years the Roumanian community of Chicago has risen, by its own latent forces, from an unorganized group to a social unit. Left to their humble resources the Roumanians developed initiative, as they had to discover alone the ways and means of adapting themselves to the new environment. They have learned to rely on individual and group initiative, because in this country the State does not assume a paternalistic attitude; any group is entitled and obliged to solve its own problems and develop its own potentialities, so long as it does not encroach upon the rights of others. If the leaders have not always been up to expectation, it is because they lacked the background and the training which the Americans get at an early age. Humble as they were, they drew the Roumanians from the chaos of disorganization and ignorance into the gratifying order of associated life.

The present social organization may prove unnecessary in the future, and the interests of to-day will merge into broader civic, state, and national ideals.

While there is yet much to be desired in the way of assimilation in so large and varied a community as Chicago, yet, judged from their economic advance and standards of living, and the purpose and achievements of their social life, largely under the direction of their organizations, the Roumanians show a marked advance, both conscious and unconscious, toward assimilation with the American community.

II. THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF THE EXISTING ROUMANIAN BENEFICIAL AND CULTURAL SOCIETIES OF AMERICA

In the course of years many societies either combined their membership in order to strengthen their organization, or dropped out of the Union for lack of interest on the part of their members. The Union has registered 137 societies, from 1906 to 1928, inclusive, but at present there are only 82 societies, which are listed below, in order of their incorporation with the Union and the League. It is interesting to note that most of these societies bear the names of heroes, especially from Transylvania, of geographical divisions, of members of the royal family, of patriotic facts, etc. #1. *U. S. Invierea si Printul Nicolae* (the Union of the Society Resurrection and Prince Nicholas), P. O. Box 1, Martins Ferry, O.—#2. *Vulturul* (the Eagle), 315 7th Ave., W. Homestead, Pa.—#3. *Transilvaneana, Clubul Nicolae Iorga* (the Transylvanian and the Club named after Mr. Iorga, the well known Byzantologist and president of the People's Party in Roumania) P. O. Box 126, Indiana Harbor, Ind.—#4. *Dacia Traiana* (the Dacia of Trajan) P. O. Box 526, Newark, O.—#7. *S. U. Unirea & Plugarul Roman* (the Union and the Roumanian Ploughman), 645 Poland Ave., Youngstown, O.—#8. *Albina* (the Bee), 1020 Jefferson Str., New Castle, Pa.—#9. *Leul* (the Lion), 114 Depot Str., Salem, O.—#10. *Sperantsa* (Hope), 2213 Clybourn Ave., Chicago, Ill.—#11. *U. R. Transilvaneana* (the Roumanian-Transylvanian Union), 735 Ash Str., Alliance, O.—#12. *Negru Voda & Columbus* (King Neagoe Basarab or Negru Voda was the first Wallachian ruler that history mentions. He reigned from 1330 to 1340), 242 Helen Str., McKees Rocks, Pa.—#13. *Fratia si Samanatorul* (Brotherhood and the Sower), 66 Tenth Str., Campbell, O.—#15. *Horia Closca si Crisan & Romania Noua* (The well known three Transylvanian heroes and the New Roumania), P. O. Box 157, Zanesville, O.—#17. *U. S. R. Carpatina* (the Roumanian Society Carpatina), 1303 West 58 Str., Cleveland, O.—#18. *Dacia Romana* (the Roumanian Dacia), P. O. Box 13, Sta. B., Cincinnati, O.—#19. *Ulpia Traiana* (Trajan's road), 1133 Penn Ave., or P. O. Box 141, Erie, Pa.—#20. *Fratii Romani* (the Roumanian Brothers), P. O. Box 43, Niles, O.—#21. *Steaua Romana* (the Roumanian Star), 613 W. Washington, Indianapolis, Ind.—#23. *Mihai Viteazul* (Michael the Brave, reigned in Wallachia from 1593 to 1609), P. O. Box 73, Follansbee, W. Va.—#28. *U. S. Armonia-Streinul Liber* (the Societies Harmony and The Free Foreigner), 2229 Park Ave., St. Louis, Missouri.—#30. *Traian si Dr. Iuliu Maniu,* 1902 Eighth Str., N. E. Canton, Ohio.—#32. *Printul Carol al Romaniei* (Prince Charles of Roumania), P. O. Box 549, Zelienople, Pennsylvania.—#37. *Tarnoveana* (from the region Tarnova), 236 Clearview Ave., Torrington, Connecticut.—#38. *Patria*

Romana (the Roumanian Fatherland), 2144 East 29 Str., Lorain, Ohio. —#41. *Cuza Voda* (the Moldavian Prince who in 1859 united for the first time the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia), P. O. Box 81, Massillon, Ohio.—#42. *Drapelul Roman* (the Roumanian Flag), P. O. Box 758, Struthers, Ohio.—#45. *Avram Iancu* (the revolutionary hero in 1848, born in Transylvania), 321-25 East 73 Str., New York City, New York.—#46. *Nicolae Filipescu* (the Minister of War in 1914), 801 Washington Ave., Madison, Ill.—#49. *Libertatea* (Freedom), P. O. Box 302, Lisbon, Ohio.—#51. *Stefan Cel Mare* (Stephen the Great, the Moldavian prince, the conqueror of the Turks, who reigned from 1457 to 1504), P. O. Box 127, Garrett, Indiana.—#53. *U. S. Tricolorul si Independenta Romana* (the Societies: the Three Colored Banner and the Roumanian Independence), 1208 Adams Str., Gary, Indiana.—#55. *Gloria Romana* (the Roumanian Glory), P. O. Box 63, Weirton, West Virginia.—#56. *Dr. V. Lucaciu* (in 1918, the Chief of the Roumanian Mission to the United States), P. O. Box 123, Clinton Indiana.—#59. *Sfântu Gheorghe* (St. Georges), 557 Pearl Str., Watertown, New York.—#60. *Biruinta si D,N,R* (the Victory), 114 Walnut Str., Warren, Ohio.—#61. *Tara Oltului* (the country of the river Olt), P. O. Box 74, New Philadelphia, Ohio.—#62. *Romania Libera si Neamul Romanesc* (Free Roumania and the Roumanian People), P. O. Box 29999, F. Park Sta., Akron, Ohio.—#65. *Lumina si Progresul* (Light and Progress), P. O. Box 151, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania. —#66. *Ana Vlad*, P. O. Box 33, Sta. D., St. Joseph, Missouri. —#67. *Mircea Voda* (Wallachian ruler reigned from 1386 to 1418), 2318 Eighth Ave., Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania.—#68. *Silistra Romana* (the Roumanian Silistra, a province), P. O. Box 457, Girard, Ohio.—#69. *Raza Luminei* (Ray of Light), 4334 Todd Ave., East Chicago, Indiana.—#71. *Aurel Vlaicu* (the first Roumanian aviator who crossed the Carpathian mountains), P. O. Box 233, Bettendorf, Iowa.—#72. *Aradana* (from the province of Arad, in Transylvania), 215 Albany Str., Dayton, Ohio.—#73. *Lumina Zilei* (Day light), P. O. Box 373, Newark, Ohio.—#74. *Ardeleana* (from the province of Ardeal or Transylvania), c/o J. Pop Cafe, Licking Pike, New Port, Kentucky. —#75. *Andreiu Muresanu* (the Transylvanian poet, whose poem, the "Desteaptate Romane", is the Roumanian Marseillaise of 1848), 244 Gilbert Str., Bridgeport, Connecticut.—#76. *Apolzana* (province of Transylvania), P. O. Box 5, Hubbard, Ohio.—#77. *Printul Carol* (Prince Charles), P.O. Box 882, Columbus, Ohio.—#80. *Romania Mare* (Greater Roumania), P. O. Box 233, Universal, Pennsylvania.—#81. *Ludosana si Isvorul* (Ludosana and the Spring), P. O. Box 455, McDonald, Ohio.—#83. *Coroana Romaniei* (The Crown of Roumania), P. O. Box 226, Yorkville, Ohio.—#87. *Dr. E. Lucaciu* (the first Greek Catholic missionary to the United States. He came in 1905), P. O. Box 116, Aurora, Illinois.—#88. *Campul Libertatei* (Liberty's Field,

in memory of the protest that Simeon Barnut made in 1848, against the annexation of Transylvania to Hungary), 1211 Ninety-Eighth Avenue, West, New Duluth, Minnesota.—#92. *Iubirea Frateasca* (Fraternal Love), P. O. Box D, Mt. Union, Pennsylvania.—#90. *Sfantu Gheorghe* (St. Georges), P. O. Box 484, New Sale, Pennsylvania.—#95. *Invingerea Romana* (The Roumanian Victory), Box 564, Sub Sta. A, Flint, Michigan.—#101. *Bucuresti,* P. O. Box 325, Thorpe West Virginia.—#103. *Vasile Stoica* (member of the Roumanian Commission to the United States, in 1918), Roumanian Hall, 727, South Plate Str., Kokomo, Indiana.—#104. *Voluntarii Romaniei* (the Roumanian Volunteers), P. O. Box 869 Roebling, New Jersey.—#106. *Fii Romaniei* (the Sons of Roumania), 112 East Second Str., South Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.—#107. *U. S. Adevarul-Aurora* (Truth and Dawn), 536, East Third Str., South Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.—#108. *Maior Liviu D. Teiuseanu* (Major Teiuseanu, special representative in 1918), 529 Morton Avenue, Hammond, Indiana.—#109. *Octavian Goga* (contemporary Transylvanian poet and politician), 415 N. Summit Str., Dayton, Ohio.—#110. *Eliberarea Neamului Românesc* (the Independence of the Roumanian People), P. O. Box 151, Tonawanda, New York.—#111. *Filiala L. S. R.A. No. 1* (Chapter number one, of the League), 153 Serb Str., Sharon, Pennsylvania.—#112. *Falnicul Zarand Roman* (the Lofty Roumanian Territory of Zarand), 5752 West Sixty-fifth Str., Chicago, Illinois.—#113. *Muncitorul Roman* (the Roumanian Worker), R. F. D. No. 6, 211 Nebraska Avenue, Pontiac, Michigan.—#119. *Reinvierea* (Resurrection), 4839 Eoff Str., Wheeling, West Virginia.—#122. *Minerii Români* (the Roumanian Miners), P. O. Box 625, Logan, West Virginia.—#123. *Glasul Romanesc* (the Roumanian Knell), P. O. Box 55, Bretz, West Virginia.—#124. *Ioan O. Popaiov* (one of the pioneers of the Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies), 1806 Fifteenth Str., Terre-Haute, Indiana.—#126. *Gheorghe Lazar* (the first Transylvanian, who has founded the first High School in Bucarest and has promoted public education, in 1818), P. O. Box Sub St. 102, 1841 East Davison Avenue, Detroit, Michigan.—#127. *Sentinela de la Vest* (the Sentry of the West), R. 4, Box 4,000, Sacramento, California.—#128. *Dorobantul Roman* (the Roumanian Soldier), 739 North Third Str., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.—#130. *Viitorul Roman* (the Roumanian Future), P. O. Box 1,890, Los Angeles, California.—#131. *Fericirea* (Happiness), 196 Mill Str., Ecorse, Michigan.—#132. *Marasesti* (the outsanding battle and victory, in August 1917), 3,026 Salina Ave., Fordson, Michigan.—#133. *Dr. A. Vaida-Voevod* (contemporary politician), P. O. Box 90, South Omaha, Nebraska.—#134. *Abraham Lincoln,* P. O. Box 175, H. P. Branch, Detroit, Michigan.—#135. *Bucovina,* 1841 E. Davison Ave., Detroit, Michigan.—#136. *Clubul Emigrantul* (the immigrant's club), 2213 Clybourn Ave., Chicago, Illinois.—#137. *Ardealul si Banatul,* P. O. Box 504, South St. Paul, Minnesota.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A

Abbott, E. and Breckinridge, S. P., "Women in Industry," *The Chicago Stockyards Journal of Political Economy*, October, 1911, p. 647, also: New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1910.

Abbott, E., *Immigration, Select Documents and Case Records*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1924.

——, *Historical Aspects of the Immigration Problem, Select Documents*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1926.

——, *The Immigrant and the Community*, New York, The Century Co., 1917.

——, *The Wages of Unskilled Labor in the United States, 1850-1900*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1905.

Abbott, Lyman, *America in the Making*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1911.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 1926-1928. The Eighth Biennial Report of the General Executive Board, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1928.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Agreement between Clothing Manufacturers of Chicago and Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, establishing an unemployment Insurance Fund, New York, The Academy Press, 1923.

America, Cleveland, Ohio, "Typographic Institute of the Roumanian Beneficial and Cultural Societies, all dailies during years 1906-1928."

The American Labor Year, New York, 1927.

The American Labor Who's Who, New York, Hanford Press, 1925.

Analele Academiei Române (*Memoriile Sectiunei Istorice*), Bucuresti, 1883, 1885, 1899, 1900.

Annuaire Statistique Hongroise (*Magyar Statistikai Enkonyv*), Office Central de Statistique du Royaume de Hongrie, Budapest, Société Anonyme Atheneum, 1904.

Annuaire Statistique Hongroise, Office Central Hongrois de Statistique, Budapest, Nouveau Cours XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, 1927.

Annual Reports Immigrant Protective League, Chicago, Illinois, 1921-1928.

Annual Reports Juvenile Court and Detention Home, Cook County, Illinois, Chicago, Ill., 1916-1927.

Annual Reports Police Department City of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., 1900-1927.

Anuarul Statistic al României, Bucuresti, Ministerul de Finante, 1900-1927.

Antin, Mary, *They Who Knock at Our Gates*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1914.

Apponyi, Count Albert, *Hungarian Foreign Policy*, London and Budapest, F. Pfeifer, 1921.

Aronovici, C., *Americanization*, St. Paul, Keller Pub. Co., 1919.

Ayer, N. W. and Son, *American Newspaper Annual Directory*, Philadelphia, Ayer, N. W. and Son, 1924 and 1928.

B

Bagley, W. C., *Determinism as Applied to Our Treatment of the Foreign-born*, National Education Association, 1926, pp. 248-251.

Balch, Emily Greene, "Slav Emigration at its Source," New York, *Charities*, 1906.

——, "Our Slavic Fellow Citizen," New York, *Charities* Publication Committee, 1910.

Banu, G., "Biologia Satelor (The Biology of Villages)," Arhiva, Bucuresti, *Anul VII*, nos. 1-2, 1927, p. 87.

Barnes, H. E., "Leading Trends in Sociology since Herbert Spencer," *Social Science*, Winfield, Kansas, no. 4, August, September, October, 1928.

Belknap, General Wm. W., *History of the Fifteenth Regiment, Iowa, Veteran Volunteer Infantry, from October 1861 to August 1865*, Keokuk, R. B. Ogden and Son, 1887.

Benziger, A., "What is Americanization?" *Forum*, New York, June, 1926, pp. 801-7.

Bercovici, K., *Around the World in New York*, New York, The Century Co., 1924.

Bercowitz, J., *La question des Israélites en Roumanie*, Paris, Jouve et C-nie, 1923.

Beza, M., *Papers on the Roumanian People and Literature*, London, McBride, Nast and Co., 1920.

——, *Doda*, transl. from the Roumanian by Lucy Byng, London, G. Bles, 1925.

Bierstadt, E. H., *Aspects of Americanization*, Cincinnati, Stewart Kidd Co., 1922.

Bird, Ethel, *Social Attitudes Conditioning Immigrant Maladjustments*, Chicago, Y. W. C. A., Social Work Conference, 1923.

Boas, F., *Anthropology and Modern Life*, New York, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1928.

——, *Changes in the Bodily Form of Descendants of Immigrants*, Report of Immigration Commission, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1911.

Boas, F., *Kultur und Rasse*, Leipzig, Vert & Comp., 1916.
——, "Modern Populations of America," Pan American Scientific Congress, 2nd, Washington, 1915-1916, *Proceedings*, Washington, D. C., 1917.
——, "Race Problems in America," New York, 1909, rep. *Science*, N. S. v. 29, 1909.
Bocou, S., *The Question of the Banat*, Paris, Conseil national de l'unité roumaine, 1919.
Bodine, W. L., *Chicago Biennial Census of 1914*, Chicago, Illinois, 1914.
Boeck, "The Determinism of Racial Stock among the American Immigrants," *American Statistical Association Publications*, new series, 1906, no. 76, pp. 206-7.
Boerescu, B., *La Roumanie après le traité de Paris du 30 Mars 1856*, Bucarest, Imprimerie de l'Etat, 1869.
Bogardus, E. S., *Immigration and Race Attitudes*, Boston, D. C., Heath and Co., 1928.
Boldenyi, M. J., *Le Magyarisme ou la guerre des nationalités en Hongrie*, Paris, H. Lebrun, 1850.
Bowen, Ezra, *Mixing the Issue in Immigration*, New York, Putnam and Sons, 1923.
Breckinridge, S. P., *New Homes for Old*, New York and London, Harper and Brothers, 1921.
Breckinridge, S. P. and E. Abbott, *The Housing Problem in Chicago*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1911.
Brewer, D. Chauncey, *The Peril of the Republic, Immigrants Good and Bad*, New York, Putnam, 1923.
Bridges, H. J., *On Becoming an American*, Boston, M. M. Jones Co., 1918 and 1919.
Bröte, E., *La questione Rumena in Transilvania ed Ungheria*, Torino, Roux Frassati & Co., 1896.
Bücher, C., *Industrial Evolution*, tr. by S. Morley Wickett, New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1901.
Buday, L., *La Hongrie après le traité de Trianon*, Paris, G. Roustan, 1922.
Buletinul Muncei, *Ministerul Muncei, Cooperatiilor si Asigurarilor muncitoresti*, Bucuresti, Anual I–VII, 1920-1928.
Bulletin of the International Labour Office, Basle, Switzerland, 1902-1919.
Buletin Statistic General al României, Ministerul Industriei si Comert, Agriculturei si Domeniilor, Bucuresti, 1892-1929.
Bunescu, C. J., *En marge de l'histoire ou bien les droits historiques de la Transylvanie*, Paris, Comité de l'unité roumaine, 1918.
Burgess, T., *Greeks in America*, Boston, Sherman, French and Co., 1913.
Butler, E. B., "Women and the Trades," *Pittsburgh Survey*, vol. i, 1907-1908, Russell Sage Foundation, 1909.

Byng, Lucy, *Roumanian Stories, translated from the original Roumanian,* London, J. Lane, 1921.

Byington, M. F., "Homestead: the Households of a Mill Town," *Pittsburgh Survey*, Russell Sage Foundation, 1919.

C

Cabot, J. Moors, *The Racial Conflict in Transylvania,* Boston, The Beacon Press Inc., 1926.

Calendarul Ziarului America, Institutul Tipografic, Cleveland, 1925-1928 inclusive.

Calendarul Ziarului Desteptarea, Detroit, 1928.

Calverton, V. F., "The Myth of Nordic Superiority," *Current History*, New York, The New York Times Co., August, 1926.

Capek, T., *The Cechs (Bohemians) in America,* Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920.

Capidan, T., *Meglenoromânii,* Bucuresti, Cultura Nationala, 1925.

Carpenter, Niles, *Immigrants and Their Children,* 1920, Census Monograph VII, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1927.

Chapin, R. C., *The Standard of Living among Workingmen's Families in New York City, Report of Special Committee of the Eighth New York State Conference of Charities and Corrections*, Columbia University, 1909.

Chélard, R., "Le Clergé Catholique Romain en Autriche-Hongrie," *Revue Britannique*, Paris, 1901, 77e année, pp. 65-81.

Chicago, *The Daily News Almanach and Year Book*, Chicago, 1900-1928.

Claghorn, Kate Holliday, *The Immigrant's Day in Court,* New York, Harper and Brothers, 1923.

Commons, J. R., *Races and Immigrants in America,* New York, The Macmillan Co., new ed., 1920.

Conklin, E. G., *Heredity and Environment,* Princeton, Princeton University Press, fifth edition, 1923.

Cornish, Rev. L. C., *Transylvania in 1922*, Boston, Mass., The Beacon Press, Inc., 1923.

——, *The Religious Minorities in Transylvania,* Boston, Mass., The Beacon Press, Inc., 1925.

Constitution du 30 Juin (12 Juillet) 1866 avec modifications introduites en 1879, 1884, Bucarest, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, 1884.

Constitution de la Roumanie Unifiée, Bucarest, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, 1923.

Cross, F., "The Teaching of Americanism," *National Education Association of the United States, Proceedings*, 1926, vol. 64, pp. 359-360.

Cvijie, Jovan, *La Péninsule Balkanique*, Paris, A. Colin, 1918.

D

Davie, M. B., *A Constructive Immigration Policy*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1923.

——, "Immigration and the Declining Birth-rate," *Scientific Monthly*, Lancaster, 1924, vol. xix, pp. 68-76.

Davis, Philip, *Immigration and Americanization*, Boston, Ginn & Co., 1920.

Davis, Jerome Dwight, *The Russian Immigrant*, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1922.

Dexter, R. C., *Social Adjustment*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.

Douglas, P. H., "Is the New Immigration More Unskilled than the Old?" *American Statistical Association Quarterly*, Boston, 1919, vol. xiv, pp. 399-403.

Dowd, J., "The Protection of National Culture as the Proper Basis of Immigration Restriction," *Scientific Monthly*, Lancaster, 1926, September, pp. 206-209.

Drachsler, J., *Democracy and Assimilation*, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1920.

Draghicesco, D., *Les Problèmes nationaux de l'Autriche-Hongrie (Transylvanie, Bukovine, Banat)*, Paris, E. Bossard, 1918.

Drutzu, S. and Popovici, A., *Românii in America*, Bucuresti, Cartea Româneasca, 1926.

Duica, G. Bogdan, *Românii si Ovreii*, Bucuresti, Cartea Româneasca, 1913.

E

East, E. M., *Mankind at the Crossroads*, New York, Scribners and Sons, 1923.

Eastman, C., "Work Accidents and the Law," *The Pittsburgh Survey*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1910.

F

Fairchild, H. P., *Greek Immigration to the United States*, New Haven, Yale Press, 1911.

——, *Immigration*, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1913.

——, *Immigrant Backgrounds*, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., London, Chapman & Hall, Ltd., 1927.

——, *The Foundations of Social Life*, New York, John Wiley and Sons, London, Chapman & Hall, Ltd., 1927.

——, *The Melting Pot Mistake*, Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1926.

Faris, E., *Remarks on Race Superiority*, Social Service Review, March, 1927.

Fishberg, M., *The Jews: a study of Races and Environment*, London, The Walter Scott Publishing Co., 1911.

Fischer, E., *Die Kulturarbeit des Deutschtums in Rumanien*, Hermanstadt, 1911.

Fisher, H. H., *America and the New Poland*, New York, Macmillan, 1928.

Fitch, J. A., "The Steel Workers," *Pittsburgh Survey*, 3 vols., New York City, Russell Sage Foundation, 1910.

Foerster, R. F., *The Italian Emigration of Our Times*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1919.

——, *The Racial Problems Involved in Immigration from Latin America and the West Indies to the United States*, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1925.

Foreign-Born, New York City, National Board Y. W. C. A., 1920, vol. i, 1921, vol. ii.

Forum, "True Americanism," June, 1926, p. 952.

Fox, P., *The Poles in America*, New York, G. H. Doran, 1922.

Fratilia, Calendarul Aromânesc, Bucuresti, România Noua, 1921-1928.

Friedman, E. M., *America and the New Era*, New York, E. P. Dutton, 1920.

Fry, C. L., *American Villagers*, New York, George H. Doran, 1926.

G

Garis, R. L., "Are Aliens Lowering American Standards?" *Current History*, New York, The New York Times Company, August, 1926, pp. 666-77.

——, *Immigration Restriction*, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1927.

Gaster, M., "The Jews in Roumania," *North American Review*, Nov., 1902, vol. 175, pp. 664-675.

Gautier-Dauvernay, "Le problème de la population aux États-Unis," *Revue de Paris*, 1927, Tome I, pp. 612-638.

Gavanesco, J., *L'âme roumaine dans la guerre mondiale*, Paris, Société anonyme Wellhoff & Roche, 1919.

Gavit, J. P., *Americans by Choice*, New York and London, Harper and Brothers, 1922.

Georgevitch, T. R., *La Verité sur les Roumains de Serbie*, Paris, Imprimerie Graphique, 1919.

Gerard, E., *The Land beyond the Forest*, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1888.

Gillette, J. M., "Immigration and the Increase of Population in the United States," Baltimore, *Journal of Social Forces*, September, 1926, vol. v, pp. 37-51.

Gillman, J. M., *The Two-fold Treatment of the Immigration Problem*, Jewish Social Service Quarterly, September, 1927, vol. iv, pp. 1-4.

——, "Statistics and the Immigration Problem," *American Journal of Sociology*, 1924, vol. 30, pp. 29-48.

Goldenweiser, E. A., "Walker's Theory of Immigration," *American Journal of Sociology*, 1912, vol. 18, pp. 342-351.

Gonnard, René, *L'emigration européenne au XIX^e siècle*, Paris, A. Colin, 1906.

Gonnard, R., *La Hongrie au XX^e siècle*, Paris, A. Colin, 1908.

——, *La Hongrie Sociale, Questions pratiques de Législation ouvrière, et d'économie sociale*, vols. 10-11, 1909-10, pp. 246, 196-202.

Goodchild, C. M., "Immigrant—Asset or Liability," *The Missionary Review of the World*, July, 1928.

Graiul Nostru, Bucuresti, Atelierele Grafice Socec, 1906.

Grant, Madison, *The Passing of the Great Race*, New York, Scribners and Sons, rev. edit. and amplified, 1919.

——, *The Saying of the Founders*, New York, Scribners, 1928.

——, *Racial Aptitudes.*

Gratiaa, Josephine, "Roumanians in the United States and their Relations to Public Libraries," *The Library Journal*, May 1, 1922, vol. 47, pp. 400-4.

Greene, A. B. and Gould, F. A., *Handbook—Bibliography on Foreign Language Groups in the United States and Canada*, New York, Council of women for home missions and Missionary Education, 1925.

Griffin, A. P. C., "A List of Books with Reference to Periodicals on Immigration," U. S. Library of Congress, Division of Bibliography, Washington, 1904.

Grove, Fr. P., *A Search for America*, New York and Montreal, Louis Gernier, 1928, also Ottowa, The Graphic Publishing Co., Ltd., 1927.

H

Hall, P. F., *Immigration and its Effect Upon the United States*, New York, H. Holt Co., 1913, 2nd edit. rev.

Hall, F., *Handbook of Roumania*, Oxford University Press, London, 1920.

Harrison, "Social Conditions in an American City," *The Springfield Survey*, Illinois, 1920.

Haskin, F. J., *Immigrant: an Asset and a Liability*, New York, F. H. Revell Co., 1913.

Herlibry, C. M., *Wanted—A National Americanization Policy*, State Department of Education, Mass., March, 1927, pp. 373-5.

Herbert, S., *Nationality and Its Problems*, London, Methuen, 1919.

Hermalin, D. M., "The Roumanian Jews in America," New York, *The American Jewish Year Book*, 1902, pp. 88-103.

Hersch, L., *Le Juif Errant d'aujourd' hui*, Paris, Giard and Biere, 1913.

Hertz, Federick Otto, *Race and Civilization*, tr. by A. S. Levetus and W. Entz, New York, Macmillan, 1928.

Holmes, S. J., *The Trend of the Race*, New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1921.

Hourwich, I. A., *Immigration and Labor*, New York, Putnam and Son, 1912.

Hungary, (*Statistikai hivatal*) *Les Publications Statistiques Hongroises, nouvelle Serie*, Budapest, Imprimerie de la Société Anonymé Athenaeum, vol. 64, 1924.

I

International Labor Office, Emigration Statistics, Studies and Reports, Series O, (*migration*) no. 1, Geneva, 1925.

Iorga, N., *Histoire des Roumains de la Peninsule des Balcans*, Bucarest, Cultura Neamului Românesc, 1919.

——, *Geschichte des rumänischen Volkes im Rahmen seiner Staatsbildungen*, 2 vols., Gotha, F. A. Perthes, 1905.

——, *A History of Roumania*, translated from the second enlarged edition by Joseph McCabe, New York, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1925 and London, T. F. Unwin, Ltd., 1925.

——, *Études Roumaines, leçons faites à la Sorbonne*, Paris, J. Gamber, 1923.

——, *Histoire des Roumains et de leur civilisation*, Paris, H. Paulin, 1920.

——, *Histoire des Roumains de Transylvanie et de Hongrie*, Bucarest, Gutember, J. Göbl successeurs, 1916, 2 vols.

J

Jenks, J. W. and Lauck, W. J., *The Immigration Problem*, New York and London, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1926, sixth edition revised and enlarged by R. F. Smith.

Jerome, Harry, *Migration and Business Cycles*, New York, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1926.

Jessup, P. C., *Some Phases of the Administration and Judicial Interpretation of the Immigration Act of 1924*, Yale Law Journal, 1926, vol. 35, pp. 705-724.

Jewish Daily Bulletin, New York, October–December, 1926, January–December, 1927.

Johnson, A., *A Guide to the Study of Charities and Corrections by means of the Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections*, Indianapolis, Executive Committee of the Conference, 1908, vol. 134, 1874-1907.

Johnson, G. R., *News Variation in an American Journal* (Master's Essay), New York, Columbia University, May, 1916.

Joseph, S., *Jewish Immigration to the United States*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1914.

K

Kallen, H. M., *Culture and Democracy in the United States*, New York, Boni and Liveright, 1924.

Kellog, P., *The Minimum Wage and Immigrant Labor*, Conference of Social Work, 1911.

——, *The Pittsburgh Survey*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1914.

——, *The Pittsburgh District Civic Frontage*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1914, 6 vols.

Kellor, Frances, *Immigration and the Future*, New York, George H. Doran, 1920.

Kennard, Dorothy Katherine (Barclay) Lady, *A Roumanian Diary*, London, W. Heineman, 1917.

Kennedy, J. C. and others, *Wages and Family Budgets in the Chicago Stockyard District*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1914.

Kiepert, Heinrich & Huelsen, C. C. F., *Formae orbis antiqui*, Berlin, D. Reimer, 1901-1903.

Knopf, S. A., *What Shall we Do with the Consumptive Poor?* Boston, Proceedings of National Conference of Charities and Corrections, 1902.

Kogâlniceanu, M., *Cronicele Românièi sau Letopisetele Moldovei si Valachiei*, Bucuresti, 1872, 3 vols., edition II.

——, *Desrobirea Tiganiloru; Doborirea pronomiiloru si privilegiiloru de nascere si de casta; Emanciparea Teraniloru*, Bucuresti, Academia Româna, Serbarea Aniversala, 1891.

——, *Histoire de la Valachie, de la Moldavie et des Valaques Transdanubiens, 1241-1792*, Berlin, 1837.

Kohler, M. J., *Jewish Disabilities in the Balkan States, New York*, The American Jewish Committee, 1916, addresses delivered at the twenty-second Council of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations on January 18, 1911, New York.

Kroeber, A. L., *Anthropology*, New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1923.

L

Laughlin, H. H., *Analysis of America's Melting Pot*, Washington, D. C., United States House of Representatives, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings, November 21, 1921, serial 7-c, 1923.

Legouis, J., "Les problèmes d'émigration devant l'opinion mondiale," *Revue Économique Internationale*, Bruxelles, 1926, Année 18, vol. 4, pp. 36-65.

Levasseur, E., *Emigration in the Nineteenth Century*, translated from l'Economiste Français, Septembre 27, October 4, 1884, in House Executive Documents, 49th Congress (Ex. Doc., No. 157), 1886-7.

Levay, Baron Louis de, "The Hungarian Emigration Law," in North *American Review*, vol. 182, June, 1906, pp. 115-122.

Lewis, E. R., *America, Nation or Confusion,* New York and London, Harper and Brothers, 1928.

Literary Digest, "Criticism of National Origins Quota," January 22, 1927.

——, "Fewer Immigrants," September 1, 1928.

——, "Roumanians in the United States," October 11, 1919.

Loeb, I., *La Situation des Israélites en Turquie,* Paris, J. Baer & Co., 1877.

Lupu, N., *Roumania and the War,* Boston, The Gorman Press, R. G. Badger, 1919.

——, *Vital Problems Affecting the New Roumania,* Paris, Paul Dupont, 1919.

——, *La Roumanie Nouvelle et ses problèmes vitaux,* Paris, Paul Dupont, 1916.

M

MacIver, R. M., *The Elements of Social Science,* London, Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1921.

——, *Community,* a sociological study, London, Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1924, 3rd ed.

——, *The Modern State,* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1926.

——, *Labor in the Changing World,* New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1919.

McCall, Honorable S. W., *Patriotism of the American Jew,* New York, Plymouth Press, Inc., 1924.

MacLean, Annie Marion, *Modern Immigration,* Philadelphia, Lippincott Series, 1925.

Magnusson, L., "Recent Tendencies of World Migration," *American Federationist,* 1926, vol. 33, pp. 282-290.

Malcom, M. V., *The Armenians in America,* Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1919.

Marcu, M., *Ce que les Juifs Roumains doivent à la Presse,* Paris, F. Alcan, 1916.

Marienescu, A. M., *Ilirii, Macedo-Românii si Albanesii,* Bucuresti, Academia Româna, Memoriile Sectiunei Istorice, 1904, 40, sec. 2, vol. 26.

Martonne, E. de, *La Roumanie, conférences faites à l'Union Française,* Paris, Union Française, 1919.

Mayo-Smith, R., *Emigration and Immigration,* New York, Charles Scribners Sons, 1912.

Mémoire des Étudiants Universitaires de Roumanie, Bucarest, Carol Göbl, 1891.

Mencken, H. L., *Notes on Democracy,* New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1926.

Mehedinti, S., "Numerus Clausus pentru Români," *Convorbiri Literare,* Februarie, 1923, Anul 55, pp. 199-204.

Miller, H. A., *The School and the Immigrant*, Cleveland, O., The Survey Committee of the Cleveland Foundation, 1916.

——, *Races, Nations and Classes*, Philadelphia, London, J. B. Lippincott Co., 1924.

Ministère de la Santé Publique, du Travail et de l'Assistance Sociale, *Exposé Général de l'État sanitaire de la Roumanie*, Bucarest, Cartea Medicala, 1923.

Mitrany, B., *Rumania, her History and Politics*, Oxford Pamphlets, 1914-1915.

Mommsen, Theodor, *Romische Geschichte*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1856-1885.

Monitorul Oficial, Mai 28, 1919, Decret Regal No. 33, Bucuresti.

Montague Bell, H. T., *The Near East Year Book and Who's Who*, London, The Near East Limited, 1927.

Monthly Labor Review, "Changes in Occupational Character of Immigration since the War," United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, February, 1927, pp. 249-55.

Muresanu, I., "Ardealul," Bucuresti, *Cartea Românească* (date not given).

Murphy, J. P., *The Immigrant as a Factor in Social Case Work in the Courts*, New York, National Probation Association, Inc., 1926.

Muzet, A., *La Roumanie Nouvelle*, Paris, Pierre Roger, 1920.

N

National Industrial Conference Board, *The Immigration Problem in the United States*, New York, Research Report no. 58, May, 1923.

Nikolitch, D., *Les différends de frontières de l'Albanie*, Paris, A. Pedoue, 1927.

O

Obedeanu, M. G., *La Roumanie Économique*, Paris, E. Leroux, 1876.

Official Bulletin, *International Labor Office*, Geneva, League of Nations, vol. i, 1920—vol. xii, 1927.

Onciul, D., *Originele Principatelor române*, Bucuresti, 1897.

P

Panunzio, C., *Immigration Crossroads*, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1927.

Pantazzi, Ethel Greening, *Roumania in the Light and Shadow*, London, T. Fischer Unwin, Ltd., 1921.

Papahagi, T., *Antologia Aromâneasca*, Bucuresti, Pub. Casea Scoalelor, România Noua, 1922.

Papahagi, N., *Les Roumains de Turquie*, Bucarest, Eminesco, 1905.

Park, R. E., *The Immigrant Press and Its Control*, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1922.

Park, R. E. and Miller, H. A., *Old World Traits Transplanted*, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1921.

Parkinson, Maude, *Twenty Years in Roumania*, New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., 1922.

Phelps, E. M., *Immigration*, New York, H. W. Wilson Co., 1920.

The Pittsburgh Survey findings, New York, The Russell Sage Foundation, 1914, 6 vols.

Plumptre, Mrs. H. P., *The Canadian Immigration Law and the Trend of Public Opinion*, Toronto, Conference of Social Work, 1924.

Popovici, J., "Les noms des Roumains de l'Istrie," *Roumanie*, vol. 22, 1903, pp. 121-124.

Pouqueville, F. C. H. L., *Voyage de la Grèce*, Paris, Firmin Didot, 1826.

——, *Travels in Epirus, Albania, Macedonia and Thessaly*, London, R. Phillips and Co., 1820.

Printa, C., *Les Koutzovalaques et la question macédonienne, Questions Diplomatiques et Coloniales*, vol. 25, 1908, pp. 431-448.

Pupin, M., *From Immigrant to Inventor*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 8th edition, 1923.

Putnam, G. H., "True Americanism," *Forum*, June, 1926, p. 952.

R

Reuter, E. B ., "Immigration and the American Birth Rate," *Journal of Applied Sociology*, Los Angeles, 1924, vol. viii, pp. 274-282.

Rex, F., "The Roumanian Population of Chicago," Chicago, *Municipal Reference Library*, Communication of November 26, 1926.

Rey, Leon, "Observations sur les premiers habitats de la Macédoine, recueillies par le service archéologique de l'armée d'Orient, École française d'Athènes, *Bulletin de correspondence héllenique*, 1917-1919, fascicule I.

Rich, Mrs. K. F., *Separated Families*, Conference of Social Work, 1927, p. 530.

Riis, J. A., *How the Other Half Lives; Studies Among the Tenements*, New York, 1890.

——, *The Making of an American*, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1922.

Ripley, W. Z., *The Races of Europe, a Sociological Study*, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1923.

Robbins, B. R., *Immigration and Americanization*, New York, 1924 (publishing house not given)

Roberts, K. L., *Why Europe Leaves Home*, Indianapolis, The Bobbs Merrill Co., 1922.

Roberts, P., *The Problem of Americanization*, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1920.

Roberkoff, J., *Roumanie, Année Sociale Internationale*, 1912, 3-me année, p. 99.

Roche, Josephine, *The Effect of the Cable Law on the Citizenship Status of Foreign Women*, Conference of Social Work, p. 611.

Rommenhoeller, C. G., *La Grand Roumanie*, La Haye, Martinus Nijhoff, 1926.

Rosenquet, C. M., "The Basis of Americanization," *Southwestern Political Science Quarterly*, vol. vii, pp. 372-80, March, 1927.

Ross, E. A., *The Old World in the New*, New York, The Century Co., 1914.

Report of the Commission Set by the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities, Roumania, Ten Years After, Boston, Mass., The Beacon Press, 1928.

Rubin, A., *Les Roumains de Macédoine*, Bucarest, Imprimerie D. C. Ionnescu, 1913.

Rugg, H., *America and Her Immigrants*, The Social Science Pamphlets, second edition, vol. iii, pamphlet i, 1923-1926.

Ruppin, A., *Die Juden in Rumanien*, Berlin, 1908.

S

Safford, V., *Immigration Problems*, New York, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1925.

Sayons, E., *Histoire Générale des Hongrois*, Paris, Librairie Académique, 1876, 2 vols.

School and Society, "Adult Alien Schools in New York City," July 7, 1928, vol. xxvii, no. 706, pp. 11-12.

Schwarzfeld, E., "The Jews of Roumania, from the earliest time to the present day," *American Jewish Year Book*, New York, 1901-1902, September 14–October 1, pp. 25-29.

Schwiedland, F. A., *Esquisses de la Vie Populaire en Hongrie*, d'après M. le Baron Gabriel de Pronay, Pest, Hermann Geibel, 1857.

Seton-Watson, R. W., *Corruption and Reform in Hungary, a Study of Electoral Practice*, London, A. Constable & Co., Ltd., 1911.

——, under pseudonym Scotus Viator, *Political Persecution in Hungary; An Appeal to British Public Opinion*, London, Constable & Co., Ltd., 1908.

——, *Racial Problems in Hungary*, London, A. Constable & Co., Ltd., 1908.

Sincerus, E., *Les Juifs en Roumanie*, London, Macmillan & Co., 1901.

The Social Service Review, "Human Migration as Field of Research," Chicago, June, 1927, pp. 258-269.

Siegfried, A., *America Comes of Age*, translated by H. H. Hemming and Doris Hemming, New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1927.

——, *American Emigration and Eugenics*, Eugenics Review, London, 1926, vol. 18, pp. 217-222.

Souders, D. A., *The Magyars in America*, New York, G. H. Doran Co., 1922.

Speek, P. A., "The Meaning of Nationality and Americanization," *American Journal of Sociology*, September, 1926, pp. 237-49.

——, *A Stake in the Land*, New York and London, Harper and Brothers, 1921.

Speranza, G., *Race or Nation*, Indianapolis, The Bobbs Merrill Co., 1925.

Stambler, B., *L'Histoire des Israélites Roumains et le Droit d'intervention*, Paris, Jouve et C-nie, 1913.

Steiner, F. A., *From Alien to Citizen*, New York, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1914.

——, *The Immigrant Tide*, New York, F. H. Revell Co., 1909.

——, *On the Trail of the Immigrant*, London and Edinburgh, F. H. Revell Co., 1906.

Steiner, J. P., *The Japanese Invasion, a Study of the Psychology of Interracial Contacts*, Chicago, A. C. McClurg & Co., 1917.

——, *The American Community in Action; Case Studies of American Communities*, New York, H. Holt & Co., 1928.

——, *Community Organization; a Study of Its Theory and Current Practice*, New York and London, The Century Co., 1925.

Stella, A., *Some Aspects of Italian Immigration to the United States*, New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924.

Stephenson, G. M., *A History of American Immigration, 1820-1924*, Boston, Ginn & Co., 1926.

Stockwell, A. W., "Our Oldest National Problem," *American Journal of Sociology*, March, 1927, pp. 742-55.

Stoica, V., *The Roumanians and Their Lands*, Pittsburgh, Pa., Pittsburgh Printing Co., 1919.

——, *Suferintele din Ardeal*, Chicago, Ill., Tribuna, 1917, second edition.

Stoicescu, C., joint editor, *Rumania, Statutes*, Bucarest, Alcalay, 1914-1926.

Sturge, Sophia, "Immigration, a Source of Industrial Wealth," *The Contemporary Review*, London, August, 1928, vol. 134, no. 752, p. 214.

Sumner, William Graham, *Folkways*, Boston, Ginn & Co., 1907.

The Survey, New York, P. J. Kellogg, editor, April, 1927, pp. 92-93. ("Such things can be, a day with the State Division of Aliens.") January 17, 1914, p. 458.

Suum Cuique, "Hungarian Tyranny and Roumanian Sufferings," *Cotemporary Review*, July–December, 1914, vol. 106, pp. 766-774.

Szabad, Emeric, *Hungary, Past and Present, History from the Magyar Conquest to the Present Time*, Edinburgh, Adam and Charles Black, 1854.

Szasz, Zsombar de, *The Minorities in Roumanian Transylvania*, London, Richards Press, 1927.

T

Talbot, W., *Americanization; Principles of Americanism*, New York, The N. W. Wilson Co., 1920.

Taylor, Th. Griffith, *Environment and Race, a Study of the Evolution, Migration, Settlement and Status of the Races of Man*, London, Oxford University Press, 1927.

Tenney, A. A., "The Scientific Analysis of the Press," *The Independent*, October–December, 1912, vol. lxxiii, pp. 895-898.

The Tageblatt's "English Department," New York, September–December, 1926, January–March inclusive, 1927.

Teleki, Count Paul, *Evolution of Hungary and Its Place in European History*, New York, Macmillan Co., 1923.

Teodorecu, G. D., *Poesii populare române*, Bucuresti, Luis, 1885.

Teutsch, F., *Die Siebenburger Sachsen in den letzten funfzig Jahren*, Hermannstadt, W. Krafft, 1926.

Thomas, W. I. and Znaniecki, F., *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, Boston, Richard C. Barger, The Gostram Press, 1920, 5 vols.

Trevor, J. B., *An Analysis of the American Immigration Act of 1924*, New York City, Greenwich, Conn., Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of intercourse and education, 1924.

U

United States Bureau of Census, Eleventh Census 1890, Twelfth Census 1900, Thirteenth Census 1910, Fourteenth Census 1920, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1890, 1900, 1910, 1920.

United States Bureau of Census, Farm Population in the United States, Census Monograph VI, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1920.

U. S. Census, Bureau of Census, Hospitals and Dispensaries 1923, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1925.

U. S. Census, Bureau of Census, Number of Persons in Penal Institutions, 1917 and 1922, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1923.

U. S. Census, Census of Religious Bodies 1926, Roumanian Orthodox Church, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1929.

U. S. Congress, 61st Congress, Dillingham Report, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1911, Senate Documents, vol. 42.

U. S. Congress, 67th Congress, Second Session, November 21, 1922, Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1922.

U. S. Congress, 70th Congress, First Session, Conditions in the Coal Fields of Pennsylvania, West Virginia and Ohio, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, Senate Record 105, 1928.

U. S. Congress, House Executive Documents, Consular Reports, 49th Congress, Second Session, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1886-1887.

U. S. Congress, House of Representatives, Consular Reports, 52nd Congress, First Session, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1891-1892.

V

Vacher de Lapouge, G., *Les Sélections Sociales*, Paris, Thorin et Fils, A Fontemoing, successeur, 1896.

Vaillant, I. A., *La Roumanie*, Paris, 1844, 3 vols.

Vâlsan, G., *Les Roumains de Bulgarie et de Serbie*, Paris, Gauthier-Villars & C-nie, 1918.

Varlez, L., "Les Problèms Internationaux de l'Émigration et de l'Immigration," *Revue Économique Internationale*, 1923, Année 15, vol. 3, pp. 415-456.

Vorax, pseudonym of Radu D. Rosetti, *La Roumanie et les Juifs*, Bucarest, I. V. Socecu, 1903.

W

Wage-earning Pittsburgh, New York, Survey Associates, inc., 1914.

Ward, J. M., *The Immigration Problem*, Poplar Bluff, Mo., Republican Printing Co., 1913.

Warne, F. J., *The Immigrant Invasion*, New York, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1913.

Weigand, G. L., *Die Aromunen, ethnographisch-philologisch-historische Untersuchungen uber das Volk der sogenannten Makedo-Romanen oder Zinzaren*, Leipzig, J. A. Barth, 1894-5.

——, *Ethnographie von Makedonien; geschichtlich-nationaler-sprachlich-statistische Teil*, Leipzig, F. Brandstetter, 1924.

Weinstein, Wm., *Immigration Laws and Rights of Aliens*, Los Angeles, M. B. Tournoux, 1926.

Wells, H. G., *The Future in America*, New York, Harper Brothers, 1906.

Who's Who in American Jewry, New York, The Jewish Biographical Bureau, Inc., 1926.

Willey, M. M., *The Country Newspaper*, London, Humphrey Milford, 1926.

Willystine, Goodsell, *Problems of the Family*, New York, The Century Co., 1928.

Woods, R. A., *Americans in Process*, Cambridge, Houghton Mifflin Co., The Riverside Press, 1902.

The Woman's Press, Handbook on Racial and Nationality Backgrounds, New York, National Board of the Y. W. C. A., 1920.

The World Almanac, published by the New York World, 1928.

X

Xenopol, A., *Histoire des Roumains de la Dacie Trajane depuis les origines jusqu'à l'union des principautés en 1859,* Paris, E. Leroux, 1896, 2 vols.

——, *Une énigme historique: Les Roumains au moyen-âge,* Paris, E. Leroux, 1885.

Z

Zimmern, A. E., *Nationality and Government,* London, Chatto and Windus, 1918.

Znaniecki, F., *Cultural Reality, Chicago,* The University of Chicago Press, 1919.

INDEX

Abbott, E., 14
Absorption of, 13
Accidents, 19; industrial, 90, 128
Activities, inter-group, 15; social, 16, 178
Adaptability, 40, 49
Adaptation, 7, 11, 66, 89, 147, 148, 171, 217; economic, 13
Adjustment, 11, 85, 143, 155, 205; of immigrants, 7, 171, 193
Adoption, 134, 168; country of, 14
Advertisements, 111
Affiliation, 41; church or religious, 104, 115, 129; Trade-Union, 126, 176
Affinities, racial, 13; social, 13, 117
Age, 35, 36, 215, 218, 229; old, 28, 31, 35
Agencies, steamship, 111
Agents, steamship, 73
Agrarian Reform of Greater Roumania, 28, 153
Agriculture, 63, 68
Agricultural pursuits, 64
Albania, 12, 24, 59
Alien, 135
Allegiance, Church, 101; district, 88; double, 14, 163, 169, 239; regional, 115, 201, 225; village, 13, 88, 106, 117
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 127, 173, 180, 186, 188, 191, 232
Amalgamation, 167, 168, 212, 218, 219. See also Intermarriage
America, 15, 96, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 125, 131, 152, 178, 190, 208, 214
Americanization, 13, 118, 123, 132, 156; Bureau of, 67, 124; Theory, 158, 160
Anglo-Saxon, 116, 158, 159, 169, 184, 250
Antagonism, 116
Appendix, 14, 221-25
Ardeal, 78
Aristocracy, 44, 47, 135
Armistice, 97, 114, 128, 136
Aromans, Aroumanians or *Arumanians*, 13, 59, 61
Arrival, first, 20, 24, 25
Art, 126
Artisans, 44; condition of, 48
Artists, 74
Assimilation, 13, 35, 117, 118, 119, 120, 144, 156, 157, 158, 162, 168, 169, 170, 187, 211; cultural, 166, 168, 172, 181, 200; degree of, 14, 126, 144; economic, 165, 168, 172, 181; ethnic, 166, 215, 218; principle of, 156-169; problems of, 12, 14; process of, 7, 16, 117, 118, 119, 120, 156, 165, 167, 196, 211, 215, 216, 218, 219; theories of, 157-165
Association, national or ethnic, 118, 120; of the Roumanian Greek Orthodox Priests, 114; of women, 151, 191, 245
Atheist, 106
Aurelian, Emperor, 12
Ausgleich of 1867, 50
Austria, 26, 27, 50
Austria-Hungary, 12, 14, 18, 24, 25, 26, 30, 42, 53, 55, 74, 144, 187
Austro-Hungarian, 29, 49, 109, 222
Authorities, American, 130; school, 15
Avram Iancu, 56
Awakening, 15, 105, 114

Background, 7, 11, 12, 65; home, 12, 43, 61
Balch, Emily Greene, 227
Balea, Rev. M., 107
Balkan, Peninsula, 60
Banat, province of, 11, 19, 26, 54, 78, 88, 116, 173, 181, 183, 186, 190, 193, 196, 197, 198, 201, 203, 204, 208, 209, 210, 212, 222, 225, 227, 229, 248

Banatians, 78, 116, 117, 201, 202, 250
Banks, 128, 129
Bankers, 73
Banques populaires, 46
Baptists, see Roumanians
Baptist, Church, 42, 87, 215, 239; American Baptist Home Mission Society, 101, 239; International Baptist Seminary, 101; Parochial School, 103, 243; Review, 114, 115; Roumanian Baptist Association of North America, 101
Barriers, geographical, 12, 18
Behavior, patterns of, 135, 155, 168
Beliefs, see customs
Beneficial and cultural societies, see societies
Beranyi, Jesuit Paul, 52
Berkson, 158, 159, 163
Bessarabia, 22, 214
Bessarabian
Beverage, Alcoholic, 101, 180, 186, 249. See also prohibition
Birth control, 78
Bishop, Greek Orthodox, 94, 95, 96, 97, 100; Roman Catholic, 129
Bishopric, 97, 100
Blaj, 99
Boarders, 75, 81, 82, 187
Boarding houses, 75, 81, 82, 89, 207, 209
Bolshevik or Bolshevist, 106; invasion, 29
Bosnia, 60
"Bosses", 130
Boundaries of Romania, pre-war, 18, 30, 44; post-war, 18, 30
Boys, 79, 229, 232
Bratiano, 111
Bucarest, 97; Archbishop of, 97
Bukovina, 11, 12, 19, 26, 78, 116, 181, 201, 202, 212, 214, 222, 225, 227, 250
Bukovinians, 88, 116, 201, 202, 225
Buletinul oficial, 15
Bulgaria, 12, 17, 24, 25
Bulgarians, 17, 22, 41, 58, 60, 129

Caesar, 59
Cake of Custom, 132, 154
Canada, Roumanians in, 16, 248
Capillarity, social, 165
Capitalist, 85
Capitalistic system, 105, 106
Capitulation, 57
Carpathian, Mountains, 49
Carpatina, 91, 119
Catastrophic Theory of civilization, 134
Cases, 45, 49, 53, 55, 56, 58, 60, 62, 63, 79, 91, 122, 122, 122, 123, 125, 126, 126, 129, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 147, 148, 149, 173, 176, 179, 181, 184, 186, 188, 190, 193, 196, 199, 200, 202, 204, 205, 206, 208, 209, 216
Catholics, see Roumanians, Greek Catholic
Catholicism, 42, 100
Cattle, breeding, 13, 59
Cement Workers, 127, 188, 231
Census, see U. S. census
Changes, 135, 147
Character of immigration, 32
Characteristic, 11, 18, 32, 156
Charity seekers, 146, 237
Charities, United Hebrew of New York, 23
Chicago, 62, 71, 184, 186, 188, 190, 196, 201, 205, 206, 207, 212, 214, 215, 221; Board of University of Chicago Settlement, 71; Colony of, 14, 15, 19, 77, 80, 86, 121, 122, 126, 128, 172, 221-252; Roumanians in, 14, 16, 29, 172, 181, 221-252; University of, 14, 221
Children, number of Roumanian, 35, 89, 104, 121, 122, 181, 211, 231
Church, 87, 88, 89, 94, 98, 104, 106, 151, 198, 217, 239, 241, 247; see Baptist; Catholic, 99; Greek Orthodox or Greek Roumanian Orthodox, 41, 87, 89, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 114, 127, 129, 175, 178, 180, 185, 187, 189, 205, 240; Greek Catholic or Uniate, 41, 99, 100, 101, 107, 129, 214; of the Occident, 41; of the Orient or Greek Oriental Churches, 107
Ciocoi, 176
Citizens, 15, 22, 112, 119, 144, 173, 176, 179, 180, 182, 184, 186, 188, 194, 196, 197, 198, 200, 203, 209, 210, 236
Citizenship, 18, 111, 112, 120, 236, 237
Civil War, 20
Civilization, American, 86, 120, 133, 154, 162. See also culture

Class, Antagonism of classes, 107; Classes, see School, Education; laboring, 44; middle, 47, 80, 127, 136; of electors, 46; peasant, 13, 44, 62, 127; prejudices, 95, 148; professional, 13; working, 82, 106
Classification, of homes, 83; of immigrants, 22
Cleanliness, see standards of
Clergy, 44, 96. See also Priests
Closhca or *Closea*, 56
Clothes, 56
Clothing, establishment, 126, 191
Clubs, 85, 119, 151, 217, 224, 244, 245, 246; Macedonian Clubs, 103; Roumanian Politico-Democratic-Social Club, 119; Socialist, 104, 105, 191
Codul Civil, 141
Cohesion, group, 87, 101, 104, 117; racial, 13
Colindatorii, 138
Colonies, in Akron, 68; in Cleveland, 68, 94, 116, 119, 123; in Chicago, 14, 29, 69, 71, 77, 86, 119, 122, 123, 221; in Detroit, 67, 116; Gentiles, 14, 15, 16, 222; Jewish, 221, 222; in New York, 16, 67, 74; Roumanian, 14, 69, 74, 81, 90, 94, 98, 106, 108, 116, 123, 124, 132, 191, 200, 217; in Trenton, 88, 214
Comforts, 174, 191, 196; modern, 77, 80, 84, 85, 180, 182
Commissioner General of immigration, 16, 21, 22, 23, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 39, 40
Commitadjis, 60
Community, American, 117, 118, 119, 123, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 156, 167, 169, 171, 195, 200; center, 15, 131, 132, 136, 191; democratic, 135; life, participation in, 144, 145, 148, 150, 187, 193; Theory, 160, 162, 163
Comnosh, 173, 183, 186
Composition of Roumanian immigrants, 29, 31, 32, 227, 228
Concentration, in cities, 62, 65, 66; in industrial centers, 66
Conclusions, 216-220, 252
Conditions, conjugal, 31; crowded, 77, 81, 83, 233; economic, 58, 90, 200; housing, 86; labor, 111; marital, 36, 37, 228, 238
Consciousness, ethnic, 116, 117; group, 87, 110, 118
Constitution, of Roumania, 41, 46, 153; of United States, 109
Contacts, Community, 118, 120, 121, 124, 126, 199, 203, 205, 250-252; Ethnic, 87; Group, 89, 105, 117, 203, Individual, 133; Inter-group, 129, 132, 152; Occupational, 126; Political, 130; School, 120, 121, 122
Control, social, 119
Convention, 93, 97, 98, 113, 117, 130, 154; of laymen and priests, 97
Cooperation, 107, 116, 120
Costume, national, 79, 113, 133, 135, 136, 142, 241, 250
Courts, Juvenile, 15, 237, 238; Police, 15
Craftsmen, 48, 59
Crédit Agricole, 46
Crédit Foncier Rural, 46
Cretsu, Ion, 105
Criminality, 146, 147, 238, 239
Crishan or *Crisan*, 56
Croatia, 129
Croatians, 81
Culture, 134, 169; American, 120, 132, 133, 136, 147, 163, 169; Ethnic, 57, 98, 99, 163; New, 87, 120, 134, 154, 169, 188; Old, 88, 104, 117, 134, 154; Original, 87, 88
Curierul Român, 15
Customs, 19, 87, 134, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142; Breaking down of, 136, 137, 138, 152, 154; Death, 138; Marriage, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 194, 229; Religious, 137, 138, 142, 240
Czechs, 90, 175, 184, 185, 191, 202
Czecho-Slovakians, 221

Dacia, 12, 22
Dacians, 12
Daco-Romans, 13
Data, 144, 222; official, 20, 29, 31, 36, 69; school, 121
Death, benefit, 244
Decebalus, 12, 22
Delinquency, 146, 147
Democracy, American, 117; principles of, 148
Dependence, economic, 45, 216
Dependency, 237, 238

Deportation, 29
Desteptarea (Awakening), 105, 114
Discontent, 43, 53
Dislocation, 43, 53, 57, 58
Dissatisfaction, 43, 53, 57, 58
Dissemination, 13
Distribution of Roumanian Immigrants, 62, 76; occupational, 62, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72; regional, 62, 66, 68, 70, 71; rural, 62, 68; urban, 62, 65
District, 220, 223, 224
Divorce, 37, 141, 142, 209, 238
Dobroudja, 48
Doctors or Physicians, 74, 181
Doina or Doinas, 89, 201, 240
Doja, G., 56
Domestic service, 38, 54, 75, 190
Domnii, 113
Dowry, 175, 207
Drachsler, 157
Drutzu, 5, 16, 69
Dunca, N., 19

Education, 200, 217; adult, 123; board of education, 120; of children, 102; compulsory, 47, 121; elementary, 186, 190, 196
Electors, 50, 130
Emigrants, 18, 43
Emigration, 20, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 42, 214; causes of, 28
Employment, 33; opportunities of, 64. See occupations
Environment, 169, 228; American, 7, 11, 13, 91, 110, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 195, 217, 218; geographical, 11; influence of, 77, 157, 158, 193, 211; new, 13, 15, 16, 18, 43, 66, 87, 134, 135, 138, 147, 154, 216, 252; pressure of, 16, 168, 170; social, 29
Epirus, 12, 13, 42
Equilibration of sexes, 35
Ethnic, contacts, 87; group, 11, 14, 18; homogeneity, 22; integrity, 13; stock, 17, 22
Ethnos, 18, 22
Europe, 14, 65, 74; *Southeastern*, 17, 22, 156
Evils, social, 237
Evolution, 115, 155, 172, 190, 193
Exploitation, of new comers, 232; of peasants, 46

Fairchild, Professor H. P., 43, 156
Family, Immigration, 35; Life, 65
Families, one hundred in Chicago, 126, 221-252
Farmer, 204; American, 65; Roumanian, 68
Farming, 13, 19, 64, 65, 205
Farm laborers, see laborers
Farserotul or Farsherotul, 98, 117
Farsherotes, or Farsheriotes or Farshilotes, 25, 59
Fashions, 136
Federation, American Federation of Labor, 127; of Nationalities Theory, 160, 162, 169
Festivals, 125
Fetes, 202, 248
Fief system, 54
Finns, 104
Folk dancing, 133, 140, 142
Folksongs, 142, 143
Foreign-born, employees, 24, 69; people, 30
Francis Joseph, 50, 52, 109
Franchise, 119, 130, 226, 227
Freedom, 117, 133; electorial, 50; political, 56; social, 44, 56, 183

Gatherings (feasts, fêtes), 126
Generation, first, 163, 165, 170-215; second, 104, 168, 170-215; third, 169; young, 120
Gentiles, Roumanian, 14, 15, 74, 222, 223, 225, 227, 245
Germany, 74
Germans, 14, 17, 18, 22, 30, 55, 56, 181, 185, 195, 206, 214, 221, 223, 236, 237, 246
Getae, 12
Girls, 79
Gold rush, 19
Goga, O., 152
Government, American, 26, 156; Greek, 58; Hungarian, 51, 52, 53, 54, 111; Roumanian, 20, 46, 47, 54, 58; Soviet, 96, 105; Turkish, 58
Great War, 25
Greater Roumania, 26, 27, 28, 30, 111; see also Romania
Greece, 12, 14, 18, 24, 25, 60
Greek, 14, 18, 22, 29, 41, 58, 60, 69, 80, 81, 89, 100, 101, 125, 129, 130, 184, 214, 221, 249; Catholics or Greek Romanian Catholics, or

Romanian Greek Catholics or Uniates, 16, 87, 99, 112, 116, 117, 201, 214; Orthodox, or Roumanian Greek Orthodox, 192, 199, 201, 214; Orthodox faith or Religion, 19, 129, 197
Green-horn, 135
"Greenhouse," 202, 224
Group, allegiance, see allegiance; cohesion, see cohesion; consciousness, see consciousness; ethnic, 11, 14, 18, 118, 119, 124, 129, 132, 133, 136, 196, 213, 218, 219; local, 123; life, 182, 198, 205; racial, 30, 31; regional, 116; religious, 116

Habsburg, 50, 52
Hasdeu, 12
Hebrew, Immigrant society of Baltimore, 23; *Romanian Hebrew students*, 121; *United charities of New York*, 23
Heritage, cultural, 13, 104, 132, 136, 156, 168, 187, 213, 219; social, 134
Hero, 56, 253
History, 126
Home, 82, 171; decoration, 79; news, 89; return, 89, 90, 176, 178, 179, 185, 206, 207, 228, 240; rule, 56, 57; ties, 88
Hora, 140, 141, 249
Horia, 56
Households, 35, 81, 172, 211, 214, 222, 226, 233; persons per, 82, 233
Houses, types of, 80, 84, 233
Housing, 77, 86
Hrisov (charter), 97
Hungarians, 16, 50, 54, 55, 56, 62, 89, 90, 92, 111, 125, 129, 191, 198, 207, 221, 236
Hungary, 22, 26, 27, 226, 227
Huns, 12

Ideas, new, 121
Ideals, 240; of America, 13, 133
Illiteracy, 47, 177, 178, 194, 197, 203, 211; test, 40
Illiterates, 156, 176, 182, 196, 197, 202, 204, 210, 235
Imitation, 135
Immigrants, classification of, 22; from Roumania, 14, 17, 20, 21, 25, 66, 67; influx of, 21, 22, 25, 90; Jewish, see Jews; Polish, 80; Protective League, 131, 251; Roumanian, 14, 19, 23, 30, 88, 104, 107, 111, 112, 119; Roumanian-Macedonian, see Macedonians; traits, 187, 218; Transylvanian, see Transylvanians
Immigration, Bureau of, 21, 23; causes of, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 53, 54, 56; character of, 32; Commission, 17, 24, 37, 38, 40, 54, 55, 56, 65, 69, 75, 78, 79, 81, 82, 84, 121, 126; from Roumania, 14, 18, 66; Increase of, 21; Influx of, 20, 22, 25; Laws, 22, 26, 40; movement, 20; "new", 17, 34, 164; "old", 17, 34, 164; problems of, 16; Roumanian, 7, 14, 18, 20, 25, 26, 63, 208; Stream of, 17, 18, 227; temporary, 89, 228, Transylvanian, 54
Inalienability of land, 44
Income, 75, 84; family, 78, 79; family income of Roumanian-Macdonians, 60
Independence, economic, 44, 45, 81, 144, 192
Industry, American, 13, 64, 127; automobile, 67, 68, 71; clothing, 123, 191; coal and mining, 71; hazards of, 66; home industries of Roumanian-Macedonian women, 48, 60; Hungarian, 55; manufacturing and mining, 24, 38, 55, 69, 78, 79, 81, 126; Roumanian, 48
Information, sources of, 14, 15
Initiative, 120
Institutions, American, 13, 67, 131; Roumanian, 87, 88, 90, 91, 104, 127, 128
Insurance, company, 91, 93, 127; method, 128; policy holders, 85, 128
Integration, 118
Integrity, ethnic, 13, 213
Intellectuals, 15, 53, 92, 108, 109, 111, 125, 130, 243
Intelligence, tests, 40
Intelligentsia, 47, 104, 113, 241
Interaction, 154
Interests, political, 130
Intermarriage, 168, 170, 211, 212, 218

International Institute, 124, 132, 136
International Workers of the World (I. W. W.), 104, 105
Interview, 15
Invasion, Bolshevik or Bolshevist, 29; Slavic, 13
Investigation, 7, 11, 14, 16, 24, 67, 69, 72, 81, 221, 237
Invierea, 92
Iorga, N., 12, 47
Irish, 126, 136, 184
Isolation, 122, 129
Italians, 125, 221, 249

Jerusalem, 22
Jewish, Roumanian Organizations, 23, 181, 245; traditions, 14
Jews, 14, 22, 25, 30; Galician, 22; Polish, 22; Roumanian, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 66, 67, 68, 74, 130, 144, 181, 221, 222, 225, 226; Spanish, 22
Joseph, the Second, 54
Jugo-Slavia, 12
Juvenile, courts, 15; delinquents

Kallen, 160, 161, 162
Kiepert, 12
Kingdom, of Roumania, 11, 14, 17, 18, 25, 42, 44. See also Old Kingdom.
Koutso-Valachs, 12, 13

Labor, exchanges, 65; questions, 105; supply, 48, 64
Laborers, day, 85, 207; farm, 13, 184, 188; skilled, 38; unskilled, 38, 177, 230
Land, of promise, 26
Language, 219, 222, 235, 250; community of, 88; as criterion of race, 67; English, 62, 64, 65, 72, 86, 104, 113, 119, 121, 122, 123, 125, 144, 172, 174, 176, 177, 179, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 188, 191, 192, 193, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 211, 213, 215, 234, 235, 236, 242, 243; German, 62, 63, 181, 183, 193; Hungarian, 183, 193; use of Hungarian, 51, 62, 89; Roumanian, 7, 12, 19, 73, 104, 111, 113, 126, 152, 173, 181, 182, 183, 191, 195, 204, 236, 242, 243; use of Roumanian, 52, 73, 152, 176, 181, 183, 191, 195, 204, 236, 242
Lapouge, G. Vacher de, 165
Latifundia, 46, 111
Latin, 243, vulgar, 12
Law, see also education; abiding, 120, 131, 152; compulsory education, 47, see also education; immigration, 22, 26, 40; inheritance, 45; of Nationality of 1868, 50; of 1864, 44; of 1883, 51; of 1891, 51; of 1893, 51; of selection, 118; of Trefort, 51
Lawyers, 74
Leaders, American, political, 130; of Jewish communities, 15, 68; religious, 41; Roumanian, 15, 20, 24, 31, 35, 68, 92, 97, 103, 108, 109, 115, 130, 252
Leadership, 217, 245, 250; laic, 109, 132; religious, 96, 97, 100
League, 92, 93, 110
Lectures, 125
Legislation, industrial, 111
Legislative measures against immigration, 26, 156
Leisure time, 86
Liberal Party, 97
Library, public, 119, 125, 126, 132
Lipovanians, 17
Living, conditions, 77, 86, 233; standards of, 29, 133
Literacy, 40, 234
Literature, Roumanian, 126, 244
Level, economic, 46; social level of peasants, 47
Lewis, 157
Loneliness, 33
Lucaciu, Rev. E., 107
Luminatorul, 15, 101, 115
Lupta, 108
Luxuries, 84, 85, 182, 194
Macedonia, 57
Macedonians, 15, 20, 24, 25, 40, 58, 59, 73, 88, 89, 95, 99, 116, 218; news papers, 115; Roumanian, 12, 13, 14, 19, 25, 31, 42, 44, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 77, 79, 87, 94, 98, 99, 113, 115, 117; Roumanian-Macedonian women, 218
Macsia, 12
Magyarization, 50, 51, 57, 226, 246
Magyar, 30, 50, 153, 227; administration, 50; state, 51

Majority, peasants, 13
Maladjustment, 136, 145, 146, 203, 209
Maniu, I., 111, 153
Manufacturing and mining, 24, 38, 69, 78, 126
Marginal man, 163
Marriage, 111, 213, 214; attitude towards; ceremonies, 89, 137; customs
Martin, 90
Matter, subject, 15
Meglen, region of, 59
Meglenites or *Meglenoroumanians*, 25, 59, 60
Men, 24, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 230; occupations of, see occupations; predominance of, 32, 33, 35; professional, 108, 217; single, 35, 37, 75, 82
Meeting, 91
Melting-pot, 157, 160
Mexico, 19
Migration, 18, 20, 43, 49, 67, 134
Minorities, 117
Milieu social, 11, 158, 183, 185
Military service, 58
Modes, of action, 13, 87; of living, 13, 77, 84, 86, 179; of thought, 13, 87
Mommsen, 12
Money making, 23, 64, 80, 96, 196, 198, 199, 210
Montenegrins, 58
Mother, 131; tongue, classification of, 30, 31, 67, 102, 163, 192, 196, 225
Movement, of immigration; immigration, within cities, 86
Mutual help, 53, 99, 100, 102, 104, 106, 172, 244; institutions or societies of, 91, 92, 216, 244
Myth, Nordic, 158

Names, provincial, 18
Nationalism, 120, 168
Naturalization, 22, 144
Neighbor, 13, 129, 199, 201
Neighborhood, 81, 86, 102, 116, 122, 124, 131, 183, 185, 187, 188, 201, 202, 221, 222, 223, 224
Neighborliness, 13, 88
Newspapers, 202, 208, 248. See also press publications
Night, classes, 76, 125; schools, 123, 124
Nobility, Magyar, 111; Roumanian
Non-interference, 117
Non-intervention, 119

Occupations, 13, 31, 38, 39, 229; farm laborers, see laborers; industrial, 69, 70, 71, 72; professional people or men, 13, 38, 73, 230; of Roumanian-Macedonians, 59, 60, 73; of Roumanians, 38, 39, 44-49, 229-231; of Transylvanians, 38, 49, 54, 229
Office, public, 130
Onciul, 12
Old age, 28, 85
Old country, 151, 153, 169, 184, 186, 187, 197, 202, 210, 212, 213, 228, 233, 236, 239, 241
Old Kingdom of Roumania, 11, 14, 17, 18, 25, 42, 44, 115, 116, 149, 176, 205, 225, 226, 227, 243
Oltean, 49
Oltenia, 48
Opinion, public, 111, 156, 182
Opportunities, 43, 76, 105, 125; educational, 47, 58, 105, 123, 125, 127; equality of, 56; for employment, 64, 67, 76; for work, 66, 76; limited, 61
Organization, American, 251; fraternal (see Societies, beneficial and cultural), 182, 184, 189, 190, 194, 195, 198, 201, 203, 204, 206, 208; labor, see trade-unions; Roumanian, national or ethnic, 25, 88, 93, 119, 133; Social, 13, 23, 104, 117, 239, 247, 252
Origin, country of, 217; cultural, 116, 163; ethnic, 104, 106, 112, 116, 218
Overcrowding, see conditions, crowded
Ownership, 84, 177, 182, 186, 188, 191, 194, 199, 233, 234

Papaiov, I., 92
Parish, 240, 241, 245; committees, 94, 96, 99, 109, 240
Parliament, Roumanian, 111
Party, National Roumanian Party of Hungary or National Party or National Party in Transylvania, 52, 108, 109

Peasant, 185, 223; educational opportunities of, 47; political power of, 47; stock, 43
Peasant Party, 111, 152, 153
Physicians, see doctors
Pindus, 12, 13, 59
Pioneers, 19, 20, 33, 90, 227
Playground, 15, 122
Poles, 92, 136, 184, 191, 202, 221, 223
Polish, 80, 123, 129, 201, 238
Police courts, 15
Political interests, 130
Pomutz, General, 19
Pompey, 59
Pool-room, 89, 205, 249
Population, Roumanian, 17, 20, 26, 29, 223, 226; rural, 46
Prejudice, 14
Press, 132, 153, 238, 248, Roumanian, 15, 87, 88, 94, 106-116, 123, 130, 248
Pressure, economic, 44, 45, 47, 55, 60; of new environment, 16, 134; political, 53, 54, 57, 58; social, 44, 47, 135
Pride, national, 120
Prie, A., 103
Priest or prelate, 89, 94, 95, 96, 97, 102, 108, 109, 112, 113, 129, 137, 198, 212, 214, 240, 241
Privileges, of nobility, 44; of Roumanian-Macedonians, 57
Process, of adoptation, 18; of assimilation, 7, 11, 16, 76; of dislocation, 18; of dissemination, 13; of evolution, 133; of modification, 135; of naturalization, 144
Prodan, V., 101
Progress, 134
Prohibition, 180, 206
Promised land, 33, 56
Propaganda, Roman Catholic, 52
Property, 44, 45, 54, 89, 182, 224; holder, 45, 46
Prosperity, 43, 45; economic, 43, 60, 196, 219, 233, 246
Publications, list of Roumanian, 112, 113, 114
Publicity, 123, 124

Quota, Act, 26; Yearly, 29

Race, 24, 30, 121, 125; Nordic, 156
Rebellion, War of, 20
Recession, industrial, 28
Recreation, 85, 122, 249, 250
Religion (see also Church), 22, 31
Rent, 82, 86, 174, 177, 183, 186, 197, 201, 203, 204, 210
Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration, 16, 20, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 36, 39, 40
Representation, in Hungary, 53; peasants' political, 47, 50, 52, 53
Residence, 236; permanent, 182; temporary, 90, 186
Responsibilities, political, 130, 244
Restriction, 26
Revolution, Russian, 22
Ritual, 97
Roman Catholic Church, see church
Romanul, 15, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112
Rome, 99
Rothermere, Lord, 111
Roumania (see also greater Roumania), 79, 95, 109, 110, 114
Roumanians, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 25, 26, 30, 41, 42, 44, 61, 63, 64, 65, 68, 77, 79, 81, 87, 89, 90, 94, 95, 144; Baptists, see Baptists; in Canada, 16; in Chicago, 14, 16, 29, 78, 86, 121, 123; Greek Catholics, 112, 129; Greek Orthodox, 112; Jews, see Jews; in Mexico, 19; Macedonians, see Macedonians
Russia, 14, 18, 25, 60
Russians, 14, 41, 89, 104, 126, 129, 212, 247; Bishop of, 96, 97, 113; Empire, 96; Orthodox Church, 95, 96, 240

Saloons, 89, 109, 180, 240
Samples, representative, 23
Sas, Sasii, 50, 212
Satmar or *Szatmar*, 50, 53, 63, 88
Savings, 208
School, 13, 103, 104, 163, 235; American public school or schools, 102, 117, 120, 121, 126, 132, 167, 185, 186, 189, 192, 194, 195, 196, 197, 200, 201, 204, 205, 228, 244; attendance, 121, 124, 235; authorities, 15; contacts, see contacts; complementary, 163; children, 121; night school, 184, 195, 196, 207; parochial Greek

Orthodox, 87, 88, 94, 100, 102, 121, 185, 224, 242, 243; parochial Greek Catholic; Roumanian, 51, 52, 57, 58, 103, 104, 179, 181, 200, 204, 227; Sunday, 185; technical, 76, 124, 189
Scythians, 12
See, Holy or of Rome, 42; of Greek Orthodox Church, 41
Segregation, 118, 133
Selection, Law of, 118
Serbs, Serbians or *Servians*, 41, 60, 80, 81, 89, 104, 129, 130, 136, 191, 212, 236, 240, 246
Serbia, 222
Serfdom, 44; abolition of, 44, 54
Settlement, 15, 131, 132, 136, 221, 223, 251; permanent, 29, 176
Sex, 24, 31, 32, 37
Sibiu, 94, 95, 96, 97
Slavs, 56, 72, 90
Slaughtering and meat packing, 71, 74
Sliding scale system, 93
Socialism, 105
Socialist, American, 105; club, 87, 104, 246, 248; Federation of Roumanian Socialist Workers of United States, 104; Parties, 104; Societies, 246; Workers, 15, 104, 246
Socialization, 114, 132; of Baptists, 101; of Roumanian Catholics, 100
Societies, Beneficial and cultural, 85, 87, 90, 91, 92, 94, 98, 106, 108, 113, 115, 119, 127, 128, 151, 153, 175, 178, 239, 253, 254, 255; Roumanian Jewish, 23; Roumanian-Macedonian, 99
Solidarity, 87; ethnic, 92; national, 50, 90; patriotic, 53
Sources, of information, 14, 15; of official data, 20
Soviet, see government
Standards, 13, 77-86; American, 120, 126, 156, 172; of cleanliness, 77, 83, 84, 204, 210, 234; of living, 29, 79, 85, 133, 216
State, 104, 252; Church, 41; Institution, 46; Magyar or Hungarian, 51, 54; Roumanian, 46
Status, Transylvanians' economic, 54, 55; social, 47, 55; Roumanian-Macedonians social, 58
Steiner, J., 14, 221
Students, 125; College, 76, 121; in Roumania, 52
Subjects, matter of study, 15, 18
Subsidy of Roumanian government, 58
Suciu, Dr., 109
Sufana, 90
Survival, 118, 155
Survey, 14; in Chicago, 35; Pittsburgh, 81
Swabs, 50
Szeklers, 50, 55

Taxation, or Taxes in Austria-Hungary, system of, 50, 57; in Roumania, 47, 48; paid to Turkish government, 58
Thessaly, 12, 13, 59
Thracians, 12
Tithing system, 45
Titus, 22
Tocmeala, 139, 140
Trade, 38
Trade-Union, or Union, 38, 126, 127, 201, 203, 209, 232
Tradition, 19, 88, 102, 104, 133, 135, 213, 242
Training, technical, 76
Trajan, 12
Trajan si Cultura, 131
Transcarpathian provinces, 11
Transplantation, 11, 18
Transylvania, 11, 26, 41, 50, 52, 54, 79, 88, 99, 100, 108, 111, 116, 130, 135, 144, 153, 179, 181, 200, 222, 225, 227, 248, 250, 253
Transylvanians, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 25, 26, 41, 42, 44, 49-57, 61, 63, 77, 87, 89, 94, 95, 97, 107, 109, 111, 115, 116, 202, 218, 250; numerical superiority of, 25
Treaty of Versailles, 26
Tribune, 108
Tsintsars, 13
Turkey, 12, 14, 18, 22, 24, 25
Turks, 17, 29, 57, 58
Tzar, 96
Unemployment, 28
Uniate Church, see Church, Greek Catholic
Union (i. e. the United States), 160
Union of the Greek Catholic Roumanians in Northern America, 100

Union of the Roumanian Beneficial and cultural societies often referred to as Union, merged into the Union and League of Roumanian Beneficial and cultural societies of America, Inc. (U.S. R.A.), 92, 93, 94, 109, 110, 113, 114, 115, 116, 130, 150, 153, 206
Union, International Workers of the World (I.W.W.), 104, 105, 106
United States, or *Union,* 160; Bureau of Labor; Census, 16, 30, 31, 32, 42, 66, 67, 68, 121, 223, 225, 226
Utopia, 162

Volunteer, 144
Voting, 50
Vulturul, 91, 92
Wages, 45, 46, 55, 56, 62, 63, 65, 77, 78, 79, 173, 175, 177, 179, 181, 184, 185, 186, 188, 190, 191, 194, 196, 197, 198, 200, 202, 204, 207, 208, 224, 231; daily average, 55, 77, 78; earners, 89; high, 64, 65, 83, 84, 85; small, 54; weekly average, 77, 79; women's, 78, 179, 183, 186, 188, 191, 194, 196, 197, 199, 202, 204, 210, 232
Wallachia, 22, 48
War, Civil, 20; Great, 25, 109, 208; World, 113, 144, 173
Women, 24, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 74, 89, 124, 132, 135, 230; American; in industry, 74, 179, 193; organizations of, 151, 184; Roumanian-Macedonians, 60, 75; Transylvanians, 54; wages of, 179, 183
Work, 126. See also occupations
Workers, Workmen or Workingmen, compensation, 128; industrial, 80; iron and steel, 70, 71, 73; newspaper, 107; organizations of, 247; cultural Association of the Roumanian workers of the World, 104, 105, 106, 246; Roumanian, 108, 109, 111, 126, 127; Roumanian Socialist, 104
Writing, 91

Xenopol, 12

Y. M. C. A., 15, 123, 132
Y. W. C. A., 15, 119, 123, 132, 136

Zangwill, 157

VITA

Christine Avghi Galitzi was born in Constantza, Roumania, September 27, 1899. She attended the French National Lycée of Constantinople and took the " Diplôme de Fin Etudes Secondaires " in 1914. During the World War she volunteered first with the Roumanian Red Cross and then with the American Red Cross and was instrumental in promoting the Roumanian Junior Red Cross, as the Assistant Director of the American Junior Red Cross in Roumania. In 1921 she went to Paris to continue her studies, entered the Sorbonne, where she took her B. A. in the spring of 1922 and the " Certificat de Licence en Morale et Pédagogie " in July, 1922, when she received also the " Diplôme de Surintendante de France " from the " Ecole des Surintendantes de France ", under the " Ministères de la Guerre et du Travail ". In the summer of 1922 she attended the International Summer School of the Y. W. C. A., in London, and in the fall of 1922 she came to New York, to study at the New York School of Social Work, which awarded her for two years the Willard Straight Scholarship. She attended Columbia University from February, 1923 to June, 1924, when she received the Diploma of the New York School of Social Work and the M. A. degree from Columbia University. From October, 1924 to March, 1926 she was the General Secretary of the Y. W. C. A. in Roumania and the Secretary of the Women's Section of the Roumanian Institute of Sociology, where she promoted research studies in Child Welfare. While in Bucarest she attended the Law School of the University of

Bucarest in 1925. From April to September, 1926 she carried out some research work for the International Migration Service in Greece and in France, then returned to the United States and resumed her graduate studies at Columbia University during three academic years, 1926-1929. For two and one-half years of this period she has held a fellowship from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and the Rockefeller Foundation which has made possible the investigations and research the results of which are presented in her dissertation entitled "A study of assimilation among the Roumanians in the United States." When the Institute of Roumanian Culture was organized in 1926 under the auspices of Columbia University, she was asked to serve as the General Secretary. She attended Seminars in Social Legislation and Sociology conducted by Professors Franklin Henry Giddings, Samuel McCune Lindsay, and Alvan A. Tenney. She has published two articles, one "Education in Roumania" in the special Bulletin issued in October, 1926 by the Society of Friends of Roumania, New York City, Fischer Press and the other "Child Welfare in Roumania" published by courtesy of the Child Welfare Committee of America, Inc., Publication No. 58, Series 1928.

Stanford University Library
Stanford, California

In order that others may use this book, please return it as soon as possible, but not later than the date due.